DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 635 HE 013 020

AUTHOR Turner, Solveig, M., Ed.
TITLE Evaluation of Foreign Educational Credentials and Recognition of Degree Equivalences.
INSTITUTION Northeastern Univ., Boston, Mass.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 77p.; Proceedings of the Conference at the Warren Center, Northeastern University (Boston, MA, May 2, 1979).
AVAILABLE FROM Center for International Higher Education Documentation, Northeastern University, 360 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA 02130 ($5.00)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Advanced Placement; College Applicants; College Credits; *Credentials; *Degrees (Academic); Educational Policy; Equivalency Tests; *Evaluation Criteria; *Foreign Students; Higher Education; *Prior Learning; Program Evaluation; Qualifications; Reputation; *Student Evaluation; Transfer Policy
IDENTIFIERS Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

Conference proceedings on evaluation of credentials and degree equivalences of foreign students are presented. The conference was designed to improve evaluations in Massachusetts and to encourage more cooperation and greater consistency. Contributions are as follows: a UNESCO approach by Sanford Jameson; the approach of the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs by Hugh M. Jenkins; patterns of educational systems by Joel B. Slocum; and problems and resources in credentials evaluations by Gary W. Hopkins. Summaries of panel discussions on undergraduate and graduate study include the following: institutional policies on foreign student admission, communication with foreign applicants, evaluation practices, what certificates and diplomas to accept, when and how to award advanced standing credit, how to assess previous foreign study for transfer credit, verifying the authenticity of foreign educational credentials, how to understand different grading systems, evaluation of letters of recommendation, assessing foreign institutions, assessment of English-language skills, and professional licensing. Appendices include details of the UNESCO approach to credentials evaluations, an article on education in the People's Republic of China by G. James Haas, and a bibliography. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED192635

EVALUATION OF FOREIGN EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS AND RECOGNITION OF DEGREE EQUIVALENCES

Proceedings of the Conference
at the Warren Center
Northeastern University
May 2, 1979

Edited by
Solveig M. Turner

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Northeastern
Univ.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 013 020

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION DOCUMENTATION
Northeastern University
Boston
1979

PREFACE

The Northeastern University Center for International Higher Education Documentation (CIHED) was established in 1976 as an outgrowth of the compilation and publication of The International Encyclopedia of Higher Education. The Center's functions are as follows: to collect, monitor and disseminate information on global trends in postsecondary education; to conduct research and publish said research, independently and on a contractual basis; to serve as the University's official reception and appointment center for international visitors; to sponsor seminars and conferences for local and national audiences interested in international education; and to serve as a reference resource for Northeastern University and, on a fee basis, for others relative to the evaluation of foreign student credentials.

In all endeavors CIHED seeks to approach higher education issues from a global or regional view in order to study national problems in a broader, more meaningful context. This approach dictated both the structure and selection of speakers for the CIHED conference on the Evaluation of Foreign Educational Credentials and Recognition of Degree Equivalences. The structure was that of an inverted pyramid beginning with an international overview, followed by the U.S. national perspective, and concluding with an in-depth review of the evaluation problems of area practitioners. An outstanding roster of speakers was assembled to address the complexities of the issue. These speakers then participated in free-wheeling discussions with conference attendees, who also had a considerable wealth of experiences to relate.

The publication of the proceedings is a further effort by CIHED to share the combined expertise of all conference participants with other interested parties. It is our hope that the proceedings will stimulate discussions both within and among the many U.S. colleges and universities that are presently seeking to establish institutional policies relative to the evaluation of foreign student credentials.

Joy Winkie Viola
Director
Center for International Higher
Education Documentation

FOREWORD

There are an estimated 235,000 foreign students in U.S. higher education institutions today and each of these students carries with him/her a number of educational credentials as portable signs of educational achievement. Most students believe that these credentials will be accepted as readily as travelers checks, recognizable instantly, everywhere. When this is not the case, the result is much anxiety and frustration.

Most students fail to recognize that educational credentials at home as well as abroad serve a control function: they are expected to inform the public about acceptable educational standards, protect the public from those not qualified to perform professional services, and also are expected to regulate the supply of practitioners. The foreign credentials evaluator thus becomes the keeper of standards and rules. The problem is to determine what standards and what rules as even UNESCO's member states cannot agree on matters of evaluation and recognition.

The Conference on the "Evaluation of Foreign Educational Credentials and Recognition of Degree Equivalences" was convened to bring the problem of foreign credentials evaluations into a more manageable format in Massachusetts and to encourage more cooperation and greater consistency in evaluations. The invited admissions officers, faculty, and foreign credentials evaluators shared their problems and solutions and a number of common problem areas were identified:

1. There is little contact and interchange of information among practioners in the different institutions;

2. Most evaluators in colleges and universities work with foreign credentials for only a short period. They then move on to other endeavors and the skills they have developed often are not transfered to their replacements;

3. Each new evaluator gets his/her training on the job by trial and error and, in many cases, is required to rediscover the wheel by having to find his/her own sources and solutions;

4. The great influx of foreign students -- Massachusetts with more than 10,000 foreign students ranks 4th in the nation in foreign student enrollments -- and the great number of immigrants have appreciably increased the burden on area evaluators.

By bringing together experienced and neophyte evaluators from area institutions and agencies, the Conference allowed participants to form a network of personal contacts and thus draw upon a larger collective expertise.

The morning papers outlined international and national activities, trends, and resources and the afternoon panels expanded on the individual concerns of the participants. Also included in this volume, graciously contributed by G. James Haas, Assistant Director of Admissions, Indiana University, is a paper on evaluation of Chinese credentials which was prepared for the NAFSA Wingspread Conference.

The editor hopes that this volume will help stimulate further contact and cooperation between and among evaluators in universities, colleges, and government agencies.

June 1979

Solveig M. Turner
Editor
Assistant Director
Center for International Higher
Education Documentation

CONTENTS

Preface i

Foreword ii

Contents iv

List of Contributors vi

PART I

INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS IN THE EVALUATION OF FOREIGN EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS AND RECOGNITION OF DEGREE EQUIVALENCES

The Evaluation of Foreign Educational Credentials: A UNESCO Approach
Sanford Jameson 2

The Foreign Student and the U.S. College and University - the NAFSA Approach. Hugh M. Jenkins 7

Patterns of Educational Systems
Joel B. Slocum 12

Problems and Resources in Credentials Evaluations
Gary W. Hopkins 19

PART II

SUMMARIES OF PANEL DISCUSSIONS

Undergraduate Study
Institutional Policies on Foreign Student Admission 27
Communication with Foreign Applicants 27
Evaluations Practices 28
What Certificates and Diplomas to Accept 28
When and How to Award Advanced Standing Credit 29
How to Assess Previous Foreign Study for Transfer Credit 30
Lack of Subjective and Comparative Data 31

CONTENTS (cont'd)

Graduate Study
How to Verify the Authenticity of Foreign Educational Credentials ... 33
How to Assess in U.S. Terms the Level of Education Achieved Abroad 34
Determination of Transfer Credits 35
How to Understand Different Grading Systems 36
Evaluation of Letters of Recommendation 38
Assessing the Academic Standing and Reputation of Foreign Institutions 38
Determination of English-Language Skills of Applicants Prior to Arrival at the University 39
The Need for Consistency Among Institutions in Evaluations for Professional Licensing 40

PART III

APPENDICES

UNESCO Draft Convention 43

Education in the People's Republic of China
G. James Haas 55

Selected Bibliography 65

Conference Program 68

CONTRIBUTORS

Stephen Bissell, Assistant Director of Admissions and Coordinator of Foreign Students, Northeastern University

Eugene Chamberlain, Associate Director of Admissions and Advisor to Foreign Students, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Dennis DiCarlo, Education Specialist, Bureau of Teacher Preparation, Certification, and Placement, Massachusetts Department of Education

Barbara Hammond, Administrative Assistant to the Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University

Ann Hilferty, Director, English as a Second Language Program, Northeastern University

Gary W. Hopkins, Assistant Director of Admissions, University of Delaware

Sanford Jameson, Director, Office of International Education, College Entrance Examination Board

Hugh M. Jenkins, Executive Vice President, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs

Beverly LaSonde, Acting Director of Admissions, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University

Albert C. Lefebvre, Academic Services Officer, College of Professional Studies, University of Massachusetts, Boston

Joel B. Slocum, Director, Foreign Student Services, Columbia University

Solveig M. Turner, Assistant Director, Center for International Higher Education Documentation, Northeastern University

Joy W. Viola, Director, Center for International Higher Education Documentation, Northeastern University

Hazel M. Williamson, Center for International Higher Education Documentation, Northeastern University

Andrea Wolley, Assistant Director of Admissions, Boston University

PART I

INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS IN THE EVALUATION OF FOREIGN EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS AND RECOGNITION OF DEGREE EQUIVALENCES

THE EVALUATION OF FOREIGN EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS: A UNESCO APPROACH

Sanford Jameson

The attention given to the world-wide mobility of students, scholars, and professionals since the end of World War II has escalated during the last 10 years. As a result, there is an increasing need for the evaluation of educational credentials. Governments have tried to solve the resulting problem unilaterally, bilaterally, regionally, and multilaterally through international bodies. None of these methods has been totally successful. It has, however, become increasingly clear over the last few years that no automatic system of degree equivalence could possibly be accepted in very many countries. This view, traditionally held in the United States, has now been accepted by most of the countries of Europe, Latin America, and by a number of those in Asia. All of these countries have begun to realize that individual evaluation of the credentials presented by a foreign scholar to an institution in another country is a necessity if the scholar is to be given due credit for all that he or she has learned and if the scholar is not to be given credit or academic standing for work not completed.

Admissions officers have struggled for years to understand educational systems throughout the world in order to translate foreign applicants' credentials so as to determine their qualifications for acceptance by U.S. institutions. Only an accurate interpretation of foreign educational credentials can make possible a fair decision as to where the foreign applicants fit into the U.S. educational system. Similarly, the officials of licensing authorities have had problems in properly evaluating the credentials of those applying for professional acceptance.

But how can an officer fairly evaluate each foreign candidate? Each foreign system is different; each student is unique; each U.S. college or university has its own educational purpose and admissions policies which may differ from those to which the applicant is accustomed; and State licensing authorities have their own requirements. The U.S. system of education, which delegates responsibility to the state and local level and ensures institutional autonomy, makes it impossible to develop admissions standards which can be used by every institution.

It is, therefore, up to the admissions officer to interpret each applicant's academic history in a way that will make sense to the needs of his/her school. And the officers must do this often, as the number and origin of foreign students seeking admission to U.S. institutions have increased enormously in the post-World War II era.

Basic to the development of individual evaluation of foreign credentials is an adequate understanding by admission officers, registrars, deans, and professors of the documents presented to them. Information about foreign educational systems and the meaning of foreign educational credentials have, therefore, become a key need both in the United States and in many other countries of the world. It was in recognition of this need and in light of UNESCO's mandate to encourage the mobility of scholars and students, that UNESCO undertook, some years ago, to develop a series of conventions on the recognition of studies, degrees, and diplomas. These conventions are organized on a regional basis. It is the intention of UNESCO, however, that the regional conventions be sufficiently similar, and in some cases interlocking, so that eventually there will be a world-wide convention system looking toward mutual recognition of studies, degrees, and diplomas.

The first such convention (or intergovernmental agreement) involved Latin America and the Caribbean region; it was completed and signed in 1974. Discussions are also proceeding with countries in Sub-Saharan Africa and the Arab countries of North Africa and the Middle East.

The second convention to be completed (signed in December, 1976) involved the Arab and European states bordering the Mediterranean, and it is being used as the model for present talks among representatives from UNESCO's European region. Geographically a misnomer, this European region includes Eastern and Western Europe, Israel, Canada, and the United States.

Preparation for the European Convention has so far involved three meetings of the expert committees, one in Helsinki in 1975, a second in Paris in 1976, and a third meeting, to draft a European Convention, in December, 1978 in Paris.

The December, 1978 draft is now before us. The U.S. delegates to the Paris meeting were drawn from both the Governmental and private sectors. They worked hard to assure that the resulting draft was meaningful in terms of the long-term objectives of assuring appropriate admission and placement for U.S. students abroad, for foreign students coming to the U.S., and for appropriate recognition of scholars and professionals for the work they did here when they returned to their own countries. At the same time, it was obviously necessary for the U.S.delegation to make certain that the wording of the Convention would not, and could not be interpreted to, bind American institutions of higher learning into any system that would automatically grant rights of admission or placement to any foreign applicant. The autonomy of the admitting authorities of these institutions needed to be safeguarded.

The task proved less difficult than had been feared. The United States shared many common objectives and attitudes with a number of countries, notably Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Great Britain, and the Netherlands. A recent British report submitted to UNESCO is quite specific and conveys that common attitude:

> "Universities consider on their individual merits applications for admission from candidates with overseas qualifications, the criterion being not so much what the title of the degree or diploma held is, but rather the extent to which the academic courses previously followed by the individual are thought by the university selectors to fit the student to undertake the specific course he wants to follow at the British university. The approach is ad hoc and empirical rather than involving references to national regulations (which do not exist)."

The U.S. group heartily endorsed this philosophy.

By December 1978, also, UNESCO itself had moved away from earlier efforts at what had seemed to be simple solutions. A recent UNESCO publication in this field, entitled From Equivalence of Degrees to Evaluation of Competence, illustrates this progression in its very title.

Given this favorable climate, a document was produced which is both cognizant of the need for greater mobility and of the information needed to make it possible and of the autonomy of universities and colleges in countries like the United States.

The U.S. Government is presently analyzing the UNESCO Convention to ascertain exactly what obligations it would have if it ratified the Convention and whether it could undertake those obligations consistent with the autonomy of the U.S. educational system and the professions. Here are some preliminary and personal comments on the Convention.

Aside from the preamble and the usual articles on ratification and revocation, the draft Convention has basically two parts. The first part, embodied in Articles 1 through 6, defines "recognition" and specifies the obligations of States who become party to the Convention with respect to recognition. The definition in Article 1 is particularly important. This Article states that 'recognition' of a foreign certificate, degree, and diploma only means its acceptance by the competent authorities in a Contracting State (note: not by the Government!) as a valid credential. These authorities (i.e., admissions officers, registrars, deans, etc.) are then to grant to the holder of the certificate, degree, and diploma those rights enjoyed by persons holding a national

certificate, diploma, or degree with which the foreign one is considered to be comparable. It is specifically stated that such recognition does not exempt the holder of the foreign certificate, degree, or diploma from complying with any other conditions which may be required for admission. Similarly, recognition of a degree for the practice of a profession does not exempt the holder of the foreign degree from complying with any conditions for the practice of the profession concerned, which may be laid down by the competent governmental or professional authorities.

Articles 2 through 6 define the obligations of States party to the convention with respect to recognition. This is an area of great importance in light of the decentralized educational system in the U.S. and the autonomy of colleges, universities, and professions.

Article 2 specifies several aims which States party to the Convention agree to promote through joint action. Several of these aims might involve the federal government in areas not traditionally reached, such as the development of admissions criteria and school curricula. However, it is important to note that Article 2 speaks of the progressive attainment of the goals defined in that article. Moreover, Article 2 expressly stipulates that in pursuing the aims of the Article, contracting states will take actions 'within the framework of their legislation and constitutional structures.' Thus, it would not seem that the convention authorizes any extension of existing federal authority in the area of education.

Articles 3 through 6 specify undertakings for immediate application with respect to granting recognition to degrees for entry to institutions of higher education and to practice of the professions. Although the language of these articles, particularly Article 3, might benefit from some drafting changes, it is our understanding that the convention does not require States to recognize diplomas for any purpose but merely to take 'feasible steps' to achieve recognition as defined in Article 1 -- that is, recognition by the competent authorities. The U.S. might fulfill this obligation by, for example, participating fully in the international committee discussed below and distributing to interested institutions and professions information on degrees earned and on recognition practices in other countries. Taking actions which interfere with institutional or professional autonomy would not, in our view, be feasible steps.

Only where the U.S. is the competent authority with regard to recognition would it seem that the Convention imposes an obligation on recognition. We understand that the U.S. is currently analyzing how the Convention would affect hiring by the federal government.

The second part, Articles 7 through 11, provides the real program by establishing the mechanisms whereby the admitting authorities will be provided with increased information. An increased exchange of information through a Regional Committee is envisaged which will study the obstacles to mobility and seek to provide better answers. A similar committee in the Latin American Region met recently and began the lengthy process of describing the educational systems of the various member countries in terms which can be understood by evaluators of credentials elsewhere. It was clear that even in an area as relatively homogeneous as Latin America, major differences exist in the educational systems of the various countries and the need for comparative studies there is as great as elsewhere.

It is this second part of the Convention which holds the most promise. Not only because there will be an increased information flow but also because there will be as many as 35 nations participating in the process -- nations with widely divergent educational systems but all determined to further the mobility of scholars and teachers.

In the Spring and Summer of 1979, the responsible U.S. officials will be consulting with the educational and professional community, and with the Congress, concerning the Convention. Consultation is already taking place with the National Council for the Evaluation of Foreign Educational Credentials. If a general consensus can be arrived at that the Convention provides a valuable service in the cause of scholarly mobility without encroaching on the autonomy and authority of the educational and professional authorities, or the 50 States, the U.S. will give favorable consideration to signing the Convention when it opens for signature, probably in October 1979 in Helsinki. Thereafter, it will be presented to the Senate of the United States for its advice and consent to ratification.

* * *

Further information about the Convention may be obtained by writing to either of the following addresses:

Sanford C. Jameson, Director of International Education
The College Board, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

Alice S. Ilchman, Associate Director for Educational and Cultural Affairs
International Communication Agency
Washington, D.C. 20547

All those interested in the Convention are invited to submit their views, in writing, to Dr. Ilchman at the above address.

THE FOREIGN STUDENT AND THE U.S. COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY. SELECTION AND SUITABILITY - THE NAFSA APPROACH TO CREDENTIALS EVALUATION

Hugh M. Jenkins

The goal of international educational interchange is to see that the right student goes to the right institution for the right reasons. Key factors in obtaining the perfect match are, for the institution, the capability and academic preparation of the foreign student; for the student, the educational program offered by the institution; for both, the appropriate evaluation of the foreign student's educational credentials.

In the field of foreign credentials evaluation, NAFSA (National Association for Foreign Student Affairs) has a unique role. On the one hand, there are among NAFSA's members, admissions officers who are very experienced in this field; their initial interest and early acquired expertise have led to opportunities and assignments abroad which, in turn, have further increased their knowledge of, and familiarity with, the educational systems of foreign countries. At the same time, NAFSA numbers among its members, those individuals who are newcomers to the field and those institutions which stand on the threshold of an international educational exchange activity.

All these members, both newcomers and experienced, are part of an association which brings together in common concern all those who are involved in any aspect of international educational interchange. Thus, in addition to their particular functions as admissions officer, teacher of English as a second language, or adviser to foreign students and scholars, each of the professional groups within NAFSA sees its responsibilities as they relate to the total context of foreign student affairs, and each benefits from the special knowledge in all these areas which is available in the association. It is within this complex of related interests that the ADMISSIONS SECTION of NAFSA provides an information network by which the special resources thus available can be put to the service of all those who may need assistance.

As a result of this intra-associational interchange, it is an easy next step to offer assistance to any institution where foreign students are enrolled, and what is now known as the NATIONAL CREDENTIALS EVALUATION PROJECT, was created by a group of NAFSA members who offered their services for this purpose. The project is administered by NAFSA under the sponsorship of the National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions, which comprises representatives of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB), the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS), the Institute of International Education (IIE) and the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA).

The Credentials Evaluation Project originated in a meeting in Chicago in December 1966 when representatives of AACRAO, CEEB, IIE, and NAFSA met to discuss the lack of adequate resources for foreign student admissions among a number of colleges and universities in the Midwest, and examine the possibility of providing a program to assist admissions officers in those institutions, which had a small foreign student enrollment, and thus lacked experience in the evaluation of foreign educational credentials.

The meeting was funded by the NAFSA Field Service Program, which was operated with the support of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State. At that meeting it was decided to organize a seminar of experienced admissions officers to design forms and establish procedures for the launching of an experimental credentials evaluation service. Need for the service had been confirmed by a questionnaire which was sent to 350 institutions in the midwest. Of the 197 replies received, 117 institutions indicated that the evaluation of foreign admissions credentials at the undergraduate level presented a problem and 135 stated that they would be interested in an evaluation service for foreign admissions. The seminar took place in May 1967 and the Midwest Evaluation Project was established in October 1967.

An important factor in the determination to create the service was the decision taken by the U.S. Office of Education in 1966 to terminate, by 1968, the Foreign Credentials Evaluation Service which it had been providing for many years. This decision by the Office of Education was inspired to some extent by a recommendation contained in a report made in 1964 on the activities of the Office by Education and World Affairs, an organization that might be described as a "think tank" for international education and which, during the years it was in existence, produced a number of position papers and reports on educational interchange. Entitled "The United States Office of Education: A New International Dimension" the EWA report suggested that the Office of Education could use its resources more effectively in pursuits other than credentials evaluation. Following this report, in 1967, a specific study and analysis of the Office of Education's evaluation services was conducted under the sponsorship of AACRAO, CEEB, and NAFSA and funded by the NAFSA Field Service Program.

This history is germane to a contemporary review of the NAFSA approach to the evaluation of foreign educational credentials because the findings of the study identified a number of factors which have had a profound effect on the way that NAFSA has developed its own evaluations project. Among other things, the study revealed that (1) requests from colleges and universities accounted for 34.5% of all the foreign credentials evaluations issued by the Office of Education (other users were state and federal agencies and individuals); (2) of the institutional users, a small group were "regular customers" and, in fact, used the service as a no-expense adjunct to their admissions offices and did not trouble to make use of the information that was easily available to their own admissions officers; and (3) many of these institutions had no clearly defined policy for the admission and placement of foreign students.

When the Office of Education announced its decision to reduce and eventually terminate its credentials evaluation service, representatives of the educational community were concerned about the continuing capacity of institutions to make sound admissions decisions regarding foreign students. Another major concern at that time was the problem of financing any alternative foreign credentials evaluation service.

It was this background and this recognition of the over-reliance of some institutions on the service provided by the Office of Education that influenced the way in which the NAFSA Credentials Evaluation Project was developed. In the first place, it was decided that the new project should be limited to colleges and universities, and should be an educational service, providing evaluations only for those institutions where the foreign student enrollment was so small that an unfamiliarity with foreign educational credentials could be justified. Institutions with large foreign student enrollments were to be urged to develop in their own admissions office, a capacity for the evaluation of foreign educational credentials, and even smaller institutions were to be encouraged to profit from the review of evaluations received and thus accumulate their own resources for independent activity. To promote this self-reliance, other services of NAFSA, such as consultations and inservice training grants, would be offered to assist in the development of an internationally oriented admissions office and help train the necessary personnel.

In the second place, it was recognized that if any price tag were placed on the evaluations offered, there was no way in which a credentials evaluation service could be supported without some massive governmental or foundation funding. It was therefore decided to offer a "grass roots" program at no cost to the institutions. This would be a service in which volunteers would use their knowledge of one particular country to assist their less experienced colleagues in the field. These two principles, that the project should have an educational purpose and that the service should be free, remain the basis of the National Credentials Evaluation Project that exists today. The service is advisory, providing the institution with the information needed for it to make its own admissions decision.

Soon after the establishment of the Midwest Evaluation Project in 1967, it became apparent that the experiment was proving successful and that, properly organized, the voluntary efforts of experienced admissions officers could provide a foreign credentials evaluation service that would meet the needs of those smaller institutions having neither the experienced personnel nor the library resources to cope with admission requests from countries across the world. After the successful operation of the project in the Midwest for several years, another area service, the Northeast Evaluation Project was established in 1971, quickly followed by the Southern Evaluation Project in 1972, and, to complete the coverage of the United States, the Western Evaluation Project was begun in 1973. These four projects were operated separately until 1978 when they

were integrated into the National Credentials Evaluation Project. During the past year (1977/78) 186 evaluators provided 1013 evaluations of credentials from 96 countries for 349 institutions. The total budget for both operation and administration is $4,640 which is provided through the NAFSA Cooperative Projects Program from a grant received from the Directorate for Educational and Cultural Affairs of the International Communication Agency.

The sponsorship of the National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions is much more than nominal. The Committee oversees the work of the Credentials Evaluation Project, advises on policy and procedures, and provides an essential element of quality control. Such control is also provided by the NAFSA Committee which is directly responsible for the operation of the project. This Committee, which is made up from the evaluators themselves, makes an annual review of all the evaluations made during the year, identifies any area of disagreement or disparity, and seeks to maintain the necessary consistency in the evaluations. There is also a small team of special evaluators who may be called upon to advise on credentials that are from some relatively unknown country, or which have some unusual characteristics.

Concurrent with the Credentials Evaluations Projects, providing or replenishing the team of evaluators needed for the projects and making available new sources of information for college and university admissions offices, are professional development activities of NAFSA. Of these, the most relevant are the programs arranged by the AACRAO/NAFSA Joint Committee on Workshops which provide on-site workshops in foreign countries for the examination of the admission and academic placement of students from those countries. These programs enable a team of some 20 admissions officers to travel abroad, meet with educational authorities and visit educational institutions and then prepare a report which is widely distributed. Many of the participants are quickly recruited as evaluators for the Credentials Evaluation Project and the reports become part of the resource materials in the admissions offices of universities across the United States.

The most recent report, on Brazil, Bolivia, Paraguay, and Uruguay, was published in the summer of 1978. Prior to that, in 1975, was the Mid-East Workshop which encompassed the countries of Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia, and the more recent of previous workshops have taken place in Scandinavia, Sub-Saharan Africa, the Caribbean, and South America. At this time, the participants in the latest workshop, on East Asian countries, which took place in February 1979, are preparing their report on Hong Kong, the Phillippines, Malaysia, and Singapore, which should be published in the summer of 1979.

Although today there is an increasing sophistication in the evaluation of foreign educational credentials there are still those institutions which cannot deal adequately with their foreign student admissions either because of their

limited involvement with educational interchange, or because of the turnover in the staff of the admissions office which does not have someone specially assigned to foreign admissions. Thus the need for the evaluation service continues. At the same time, decreasing enrollment of U.S. students has caused a number of institutions to explore the possibility of admitting, and, in some cases, recruiting foreign students. A haphazard procedure of admission and academic placement becomes even more critical at a time when the costs of U.S. education and the consequent investment required by the foreign student, or, if sponsored, by the foreign government, assumes impressive proportions. In such circumstances, the need for a process which will ensure that students are properly selected so that they have a reasonable chance to achieve their educational goals in a U.S. college or university must be seen as an immediate goal of all those working in the field, and a prime responsibility of an association like NAFSA, which has, as its stated purpose, "to seek out and bring together those engaged in the international educational interchange of students and scholars for the purpose of assuring optimum benefits."

PATTERNS OF EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS

Joel B. Slocum

The key to what I will say today is the word "patterns" in the title of my talk. It is that word that should give heart to the newcomer surveying the scene of foreign educational credentials evaluation. Without some notion of pattern, our newcomer is most likely going to feel overwhelmed by what appears to him or her a hopelessly tangled jumble of school certificates, bagruts, Maturas, "O" levels and baccalaureats, to say nothing of licences, diplômes, and licenciaturas.

There are patterns to help us through this morass. In fact, one can say that there is really only one pattern throughout the world. Every educational system is characterized by a progression from primary to secondary to tertiary education, from mastery of basic skills to the broadening of knowledge, to specialization in one area of knowledge. Remembering that progression can be quite comforting when encountering an unfamiliar credential.

But what if everyone follows the same pattern? Is that not equal to saying that we all walk on two legs? Let us look at patterns more closely. If we examine the educational systems of just four countries (really only three, since one of them is our own), we will be on the way to understanding, at least in broad outline, the education experienced by the great majority of foreign applicants to our colleges and universities. Those countries are, besides the United States (which is included for its influence on Japan, Korea, Liberia, the Philippines, and Taiwan), France, Great Britain, and Spain. If we add some general principles to those patterns, we can face our next foreign credential with something between impunity and craven capitulation.

Let us begin with the countries most directly influenced by our own educational system. Of the countries just mentioned, all except the Philippines follow our pattern of six years of primary school, six of secondary, and four of college. Not only is the framework the same, there are similarities as regards curricula, grading, and credits. Note, however, that the number of credits required for a degree in Japan, Korea, and Taiwan usually is greater than is the case here. Typically, they run to 140 or more, although this does not mean that the degree represents a higher level of achievement than does ours. Another difference is disguised by the percentage grading in Taiwan and Japan (which is used much more in the former country than the latter). The "A" range usually begins somewhat lower than 90 -- say 80 to 85.

The Philippines is an exception to the U.S. pattern insofar as it has a ten-year, sometimes eleven, primary and secondary system. At the tertiary level, it follows our system very closely, including the use of semester credits which

correspond to ours exactly. There is widespread feeling that graduates of Philippine secondary schools and colleges should not be admitted to college and graduate school respectively here, because of the one or two year difference in the primary-secondary system. My own experience has been that carefully selected Filipino students at either level can perform quite satisfactorily. If graduates of some New York City high schools read at no more than 9th grade level, why should not the better graduates of the Philippine system be considered to have the functional equivalent of a high school diploma, especially if they score well on the SAT and prove themselves by their performance? This point illustrates, by the way, what I consider a cardinal principle of credentials evaluation: Do not be misled by a rigid insistence upon comparing the number of years required to obtain a given foreign credential with what is required at a similar level in our system.

Of the three systems we will look at, the Spanish is noteworthy, more for its influence in Latin America, than for the large numbers of Iberian Spanish students coming to the United States. The British and French systems, on the other hand, must be examined both for their influence in other countries and for their role as suppliers of large numbers of students to U.S.colleges and universities.

British System

The British system is probably the easiest one to consider, in view of the common language and the existence of degrees whose names we recognize. As we shall see, however, that apparent sameness is deceptive.

The two most important words to remember regarding the primary and secondary parts of the British system are ordinary and advanced. These refer to levels of more or less standardized, non-objective examinations which mark the completion of secondary education and prepare the way for entrance to university. The levels are commonly referred to as "O" and "A". The examinations are for the General Certificate of Education, usually referred to by its initials, GCE, and are administered by a number of examining bodies, the most common being the University of London.

Ordinary level examinations are given in a number of subjects at the end of the fifth "form," or year, of secondary school. This marks the completion of eleven years of schooling, there being six years of primary school. Success on five "O" level examinations, including English language, mathematics, history, and a laboratory science, is generally considered comparable to a good high school diploma in the U.S. Parenthetically, this illustrates once again what I said earlier about not being bound by a count of years. The examinations may be taken singly or in groups; school leavers typically take five or more at a sitting. The passing grades (since 1975) are A, B, C: failing grades are D and E. Previously, A through E were passing grades, and before that there was a numerical system, 1-6 with one the highest, and six the lowest passing grade.

Advanced or "A" level examinations are usually given at the end of two further years of secondary schooling. These two years comprise the sixth form, and are often referred to individually as "lower sixth" and "upper sixth." A much smaller percentage of the age group stays on for the sixth form, since historically it has been only those intending to go on to university who would prepare for "A" levels. Fewer subjects are studied in greater depth; students typically will "sit," as the British say, three examinations. The grades at "A" level are A, B, C, D, and E, with E being a fully satisfactory grade and thus comparable to our C. (The same was true of "O" level grades when they ranged from A to E.) "A" level passes are widely accepted as worth a year's credit each in U.S. institutions, that is, six to nine semester credits, depending on whether or not the subject is a laboratory science. (Editor's note: From the mid-1980s the GCE "O" level examinations will be replaced by a General Certificate of Secondary Education, and the number of examining bodies will shrink to 4 - 5 against the present 22.)

The deceptiveness of the British system, vis-a-vis our own, exists at the tertiary level. Here we find "bachelor's" degrees and we may be tempted, because of our close linguistic and historical ties to Britain, to equate them directly with ours. To do so, however, would be a mistake. First, there are different kinds of bachelor's degrees in the British system. The basic distinction is between "pass," "general," or "ordinary" degrees and "honours" degrees. The essential difference is that honours degrees (and they are customarily referred to as such, e.g., B.A. (Hons.) entail a good deal more specialization in a single subject than is true of the others.

A second reason why British bachelor's degrees should not be loosely equated to ours, is that the honours degrees go much further in the field of specialization than ours do. General education is completed for the most part in the British system in secondary school (as is generally true of European countries), so the so-called undergraduate years are really devoted mostly to intensive study of one subject and related disciplines. To illustrate, let me simply point out that American Rhodes scholars, who have earned bachelor's degrees with distinction at the best U.S. colleges, typically need two years to finish an honours B.A. at Oxford or Cambridge. A more extreme example derives from my own experience. I once took a graduate course in Latin composition at Columbia University, and was humbled to discover in talking to a classics graduate of Oxford that the book we had used in my course was used in England in the sixth form. In my opinion, a British honours degree is at least comparable to a Master's degree in its field, and may indeed be compared to an M.Phil., i.e., "ABD" or "all but dissertation." The reason is that an honours degree holder can usually proceed (in a British university) directly to the research and thesis required for the Ph.D. I do not think we would be likely to say that British Ph.D.'s are inferior to ours.

Grading in British universities is usually done in terms of an over-all classification of the degree, based on the final examination results. The usual possibilities are first class, second class (sometimes divided into upper and lower), and third class. Very broadly speaking, these can be compared to A, B, and C in our system. British firsts, however, are much rarer than United States As.

In turning to the French and Spanish systems, we are at a disadvantage if we do not know the two languages. You do not want to trust someone else's translation, because much confusion could result, as we will see. So you must learn a few important words in these languages in order to have some basic reference points.

French System

Two important words in dealing with the French system are baccalauréat and licence. The first, obviously, is baccalaureate, but as you may already know, it is not the same as ours. In the French system, it marks the completion of secondary school and at the same time is a ticket of admission to higher education. It is obtained at the end of twelve years of schooling and entails a more concentrated program than does our typical high school. It is more or less customary to regard the "bac" or "bachot," as the French colloquially refer to it, as comparable to a year or so of college in this country. In fact, conceptually speaking the "bac" is really comparable to two years of college in this country. That is because it ends the period of general education in the French system and marks the beginning of specialization for those who go on to university. I, for one, would be willing to pit a good French "bac" holder against most U.S. college juniors in a test of general knowledge, literacy, and numeracy.

The "bac" may be taken in a number of options. These are called series in French, and they are designated by letters from A to H. The most frequently encountered ones are A through D, which emphasize respectively humanities, economics, mathematics and physical sciences, and mathematics and natural sciences. The examinations for the "bac" are graded on a base of twenty, with ten being the lowest passing grade. Since passing the "bac" depends on one's over-all average, it is possible to have grades lower than ten, as long as they are balanced by higher grades. The over-all result of the examinations is expressed in terms of a mention, or mention, of which there are four: passable (passing), assez bien (fairly good), bien (good), and très bien (very good). The passable must be regarded as at least a C, since it is a fully satisfactory grade. Given our grade inflation and use of the curve, and given the more selective, restricted nature of French secondary education, a passable is probably a good deal better than the typical C in this country. The highest grade on the "bac" examinations, très bien, is very rarely attained. I have seen only one or two in twenty years. At Columbia University we gave one

two years of credit and he finished a B.A. in one academic year, 30 credits each term.

The word to look for first in French tertiary education is licence. This usually means the completion of three years of study (four in law and economics), and is generally accepted as a basis for admission to graduate study here. An almost equally important word to know is diplôme. Unfortunately, it is a word of much wider application than licence, so in order to use it effectively you must expand your French vocabulary a bit. A diplôme is simply a diploma, and it may designate anything from a technician at sub-baccalauréat level to an advanced student at a pre-doctoral stage. Three of the commonest diplômes are: the Diplôme d'études universitaires générales (referred to by the French by its acronym DEUG, and requiring two years of study), the Diplôme universitaire de technologie (DUT), also awarded after a 2-year course in a University institute of technology, IUT), and those given primarily in engineering and business by the grandes écoles (literally, great schools). These last-named are very prestigious schools, to which admission is so difficult that students typically spend two years in special schools, called classes préparatoires aux grandes écoles, after their "bac" preparing for the entrance examinations, known as concours. They usually offer a three-year diploma which in this country is widely regarded as a bachelor's degree. Given, however, that the total program is really five years from the "bac," I think it is more like a master's degree. In any case, you can usually spot a grande école by the format of its name, such as Ecole supérieure de (Higher School of) such-and-such, or Ecole Nationale de (National School of) this-and-that, or Institut de (Institute of) so-and-so.

Grading at the tertiary level in the French system has traditionally been based on twenty, with ten passing. Overall results are sometimes expressed, as at the secondary level, in terms of the mentions given previously. More and more frequently, however, one sees academic records expressed in terms of letter grades. Beware of assuming (this is on good advice generally) that these are just like American grades. Look for a key to the meaning of the grades; there usually is one. One final word on French grading: Although there are theoretically eleven passing grades, ten through twenty, in practice, the range that is used is much narrower. Many French professors consider thirteen or fourteen, sometimes even twelve, to be an excellent grade. Grades above sixteen, in any case, are extremely rare.

Spanish System

The Spanish system of education as it prevails in most of Central and South America is also understandable in a basic way through the knowledge of two words. Thanks to a common Latin origin, they are recognizably the same as their French counterparts. I refer to bachiller and licenciado. You will also encounter the terms bachillerato and licenciatura, which are the actual diplomas, the former

words referring to the holders of the diplomas. As in the French system, the bachillerato signifies completion of secondary education and readiness for university, and licenciatura refers to the first university degree. As with almost everything, there are exceptions to the above. In Peru, for instance, a bachillerato is a university diploma. They do not have a name in Peru for a graduate from high school.

Secondary education throughout Latin America generally requires eleven or twelve years. There are sometimes two cycles, or ciclos, and one can usually specialize in one of at least two broad fields. These are humanities, usually called letras (letters), and sciences, ciencias. Grading systems vary widely, with five, ten, twenty, and one hundred being the most common bases. It is difficult to generalize about them, so instead I will speak about an approach to any and all grading systems in my concluding remarks. The bachillerato is generally accepted in this country as a basis for freshman admission.

The licenciatura is the most common university degree in Latin America, and usually requires four or five years of study. True to the European pattern, i.e., French, from which it originally derived, the studies leading to the licenciatura are mostly in one field. Because of this, the level of the licenciatura is, in principle, more like a master's degree than the U.S. bachelor's degree to which it is usually equated. Undercutting the principle, however, is the actuality of national underdevelopment to one degree or another. Excessive reliance on lectures by part-time professors, inadequate laboratory facilities, and understocked libraries combine to militate against studies amounting to as much as they seem on paper.

Other terms that are useful to know for a modest understanding of Latin American tertiary education are profesor/profesora, usually the title awarded after a four-year program for teachers of secondary-level subjects; titulo, or title, which is a generic term equal to a first degree of four or more years; and the names of various professional practitioners, such as médico or doctor, physician; economista, economist; farmacéutico, pharmacist; psicólogo, psychologist; and ingeniero, engineer. These all represent programs of four or more years, and diplomas, or titulos, are issued in their name.

Grading at the university level in Latin America is as varied as at the secondary level, so again I will not attempt to generalize except to call your attention to some of the words commonly used to describe academic performance. The best grade given is usually sobresaliente or outstanding (literally, "jumping over"). Other commonly used grades in order of descending quality are notable (notable) or distinguido (distinguished) and aprobado or regolar (passing).

I will conclude by suggesting some general guidelines for understanding any foreign credential. There are essentially two things to establish about a credential: Its level, and its quality. Regarding level, useful clues are provided by the applicant's age (18 or 19 being a typical age for finishing secondary school

all over the world) and by a chronological summary, the applicant can be asked to supply accounting for all schooling since the first grade. Counting years can be helpful, as I said at the beginning, but I repeat and emphasize again that counting years is no substitute for learning about other educational systems and how they work. Often it is more helpful to know what a student has accomplished in terms of his/her own system, than simply to count his/her years of study. Ascertaining quality entails essentially to look for -- and to ask for, if necessary -- indications of average, above average, and superior achievement, again in terms of the applicant's own system. Do not try to equate foreign grading too closely to our own. What I said before about French grading applies generally. Our grades do tend to be inflated, and we pass a much larger percentage of students than is true in many countries. Remember that average performance in a selective, restricted-access system is not the same as in an open system.

One last word. I hope you will take what I have said today not as something carved on a stone tablet from Mt. Sinai, due to my supposedly being an expert, but rather as the beginning of your own study of one of the most interesting aspects of international education.

PROBLEMS AND RESOURCES IN CREDENTIALS EVALUATIONS

Gary W. Hopkins

When I received the telephone call requesting my participation in this conference, I was pleased. When I learned that I would be sharing the presentation with the previous speakers, I was flattered. It is a privilege to be included with men whose names are synonymous with international educational interchange.

With the brief time I have available, let me talk about equivalency of foreign credentials which may stimulate the discussion which will follow this session and, I hope, carry on to this afternoon as well.

There is a need for us to spend some time and effort on this topic, to look at some of the problems involved, including an historical view, and then close by highlighting some of the major resources available.

Before going any further, let me define what I mean when I use the term "equivalency." My definition of equivalency of foreign educational credentials is the "interpretation of specific educational credentials in terms of the approximately comparative level of educational achievement in the United States," which is a quotation from the Sources of Foreign Credential Evaluation" distributed (1977) by the Comparative Education Section of the Division of International Education of the U.S. Office of Education.[1]

Why should we spend time and effort on this topic? The most obvious answer is that there are many individuals who are in need of this specialized service of evaluating foreign credentials - foreign students, immigrants, U.S. students abroad, and visiting faculty and foreign scholars.

The most prevalent group is the foreign students, who in 1978 numbered some 235,000 according to Open Doors,[2] but, because of the Iranian situation, could number in excess of 250,000 students. Yung Wing, one of the first foreign students to graduate from an American college (Yale, Class of 1854),[3] would find it difficult to believe that he was the forerunner for what has now become more than a quarter of a million students from abroad, studying in more than 2,700 U.S. institutions.[4]

Foreign students, however, are not the only individuals with whom we must deal. Immigrants who come to the United States also need their educational level determined. As an example, in 1964, about 460,000 immigrants or about one-fifth of the total U.S. population increase, came here to begin new lives (World Population, 1976, 180).[5] It has been estimated that about one-fourth

or 12 and one half million of the 50 million U.S. population increase between 1975 and the year 2000 will come from legal immigration. That figure represents a tremendous need which will have to be addressed by institutions at all levels, licensing boards, evaluative services, and others.

U.S. students studying abroad represent still another population requiring evaluative services. Open Doors stated in 1972, the last year IIE reported such information, that there were more than 32,000 U.S. students studying abroad during the 1970-71 school year.[6] That was in 1972. Recently I talked to Mr. Robert Slattery, editor of Open Doors, who agreed that it is realistic to talk in terms of between 40,000 and 50,000 U.S. students currently studying abroad.

Open Doors also reported in 1972 over 10,300 foreign scholars and researchers in residence at U.S. institutions (p. 14). How many of you responsible for evaluating credentials have been requested to interpret credentials of visiting scholars or researchers by your institutions, which require such information for salary, fringe benefits, and other economic or financial considerations while these individuals are in residence at your institution? I have, and I know that my colleagues at other institutions and in other evaluative services also have performed such evaluations.

What are some of the problems involved in determining equivalences? Let me begin this section by sharing with you two brief items that show us that these problems are not new but, in fact, have been with us for some time. In a March 24, 1923, issue of School and Society appeared a short article concerning "bonafied" students. It stated that "until a more definite agreement has been reached between the American institutions of higher education in the evaluation of other foreign degrees, each foreign student's statement will have to stand upon its individual merits."[7] As early as the 1920s then, a major problem was that each institution individually was evaluating credentials presented for review by foreign students. In a June 1, 1947, article in the "Events Section" also of School and Society, we find a statement indicating that "the large number of foreign students who have already come to the United States and the increasing numbers who are expected to seek admission to American institutions of higher education in the future raised a serious and difficult problem of assessing their educational credentials." The author of this particular article, I. L. Kandel, ends by saying, "only by some concentrated attack on this problem can the variety of standards now employed on admission of foreign students be eliminated."[8] That was in 1947; in 1979, over thirty years later, we are still struggling to address some of the major concerns regarding the determination of equivalency of foreign credentials, and to develop a set of guidelines acceptable to both those providing the evaluation and those requesting the evaluation.

Without bi-lateral -- except one with Germany -- or multi-lateral agreements currently in force between the U.S. and foreign countries, and also understanding the fact that we have no centralized Ministry of Education in the United States, the method we use here to determine equivalency, is the unilateral approach. To illustrate that approach, let me list briefly some of the major concerns with examples of the types of questions that might be asked by universities and others in the U.S. dealing with foreign credentials.

1. Reason for the Evaluation: Is a simple statement of equivalency or a course-by-course subject area distribution analysis required? (Note that a simple statement attesting to the fact that a given credential equates the completion of high school, one or more years of college level work, or that it is equivalent to a degree in the U.S. system is one aspect of an evaluation, while a course-by-course evaluation requiring much more information and in greater depth obviously is a different matter.)

2. Time: When did the individual receive the credential and has the educational system of that country changed since then? How current is the information the evaluator has available on a particular country and does the resource available cover the period the credential was earned?

3. Duration of Studies: How does one deal with educational patterns in countries, such as India, the Philippines, and the Soviet Union, where an individual may complete the elementary/secondary sequence in only ten years? Can you view all countries that have ten-year or less than twelve year patterns equally?

4. Grades and Grading: What is a good, average, or poor student from a particular educational system? In essence, what we are asking here is, how does this student compare to the U.S. five point scale of A-F? To offer a brief example: in France it is rare for students to be given the best grade "Très Bien" and, if that highest grade was all that a particular U.S. institution accepted as equivalent to our "A" grade, not many French students would be admitted. However, the next level which is "Bien", still indicates a strong student in that system, and one who should be seriously considered for admission even at selective U.S. institutions.

5. Official Documents: What is an "Official" document? How do you spot forgeries and where do you turn for validation? (Editor's note: See Summaries of Panel Discussions.)

6. Credentials from More Than One Country: When and where did the individual complete a given level in one country and when and at what level did the individual enter and complete another level in the second system?

7. Translations: When, where, and by whom was the translation completed? Was the title given in the native language along with the title as translated? (Note that translators are not comparative educators and many times loosely translate documents, giving an educational level in the U.S. system that is not appropriate.)

The above is, of course, not an all encompassing list of the myriad of problems, questions, or concerns regarding the difficulties encountered in determining the equivalency of a foreign credential, but it is indicative of what is involved in that process. Let me close this section by offering a quotation from a UNESCO book entitled Methods of Establishing Equivalencies Between Degrees and Diplomas,

> "two types of problems arise in any attempt to 'equate' degrees awarded in different countries. The first is constituted by the existence of differences such as those in curricular content, in the duration of studies, in the levels at which examinations are taken, and in academic terminology - including the fact that the meaning of the same or similar terms can vary considerably from one country to another. These make it difficult and very often impossible to establish valid comparisons without resorting to a number of informed but quite arbitrary judgements. The second kind of problem arises in this area of judgement, for the degree-awarding authorities in all countries - be they independent universities or government universities conferring State qualifications - are traditionally skeptical of the competence of any outside body or person to assess the standing of their own degrees, though they themselves are usually quite ready to decide whether or not a foreign qualification is as good as their own." [9]

I have discussed the need for our services and some of the problems involved in that process. Let me close by talking briefly about some of the major resources that are available to assist in that effort.

By far, the vast majority of the resources available in the U.S. are distributed through several major organizations including the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA); the National Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO); the Division of International Education of the U.S. Office of Education (OE); the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); the Institute of International Education (IIE); and the Office of International Education of the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB). There is a variety of services offered by these organizations, but they generally center on assistance made available in terms of specific resources and such activities as conferences and workshops dealing with specific subject areas. In some cases, particularly as with AACRAO in its College and University Series, the conference reports are published. NAFSA also occasionally publishes papers presented at its annual conferences in the NAFSA Newsletter.

The U.S. Office of Education has published numerous studies on different countries, but, as do the UNESCO materials, they usually lack one of the major and most useful features of both the AACRAO World Education Series and the joint NAFSA/AACRAO Workshop Reports: the placement recommendations. AACRAO, through its Placement Guides to Accompany Office of Education Publications, has provided the missing placement recommendations so a tandem approach is necessary when using this group of references.

The Institute of International Education (IIE) offers a variety of services, such as workshops and conferences, to its educational associates or members, but the reprints in its Institution Report Series are the most informative to credential evaluators. There have been some 110 publications on universities and secondary schools in Brazil, Hong Kong, Mexico, Peru, the Philippines, and Thailand. These are considered highly useful resource materials.

No listing of bibliographical works would be complete if we failed to mention some of the following items: The Commonwealth Universities Yearbook, the International Handbook of Universities, Educational Systems of Africa all describe universities in specific countries in a variety of ways and are truly indispensable resources for any reference library. Some of you may be familiar with the International Education Research Foundation, Inc., (IERF) that produces the Country Index which is considered to be one of the best preliminary sources of information for new foreign student admissions officers. It is limited to the secondary level only and is somewhat outdated, but a new edition with additional countries, and an updating of the present information is planned for the near future. Another IERF publication, The Glossary, which has just been published, provides "a compilation of the words, phrases and terms used in academic documents from sixteen European and Latin American countries with their American-English interpretations."[10] Terminology is a particular concern in the evaluation of foreign credentials so this resource should prove to be a valuable addition to a resource library. If you wish to obtain a resource that will list most of what is available in terms of a bibliography of reference materials, you should obtain a copy of a joint AACRAO/AID project entitled A Bibliography of Reference Materials for Evaluating Foreign Student Credentials. Based on the research necessary to evaluate the credentials of the substantial numbers of students coming to the U.S. under the auspices of AID, this listing is one of the most comprehensive available. Single copies are free for the asking by contacting AID.

I would be remiss if I did not mention a new resource with which one of our two host organizations today, the Center for International Higher Education Documentation, is affiliated, The International Encyclopedia of Higher Education, which contains not only descriptions of the educational systems of 199 countries but also reflective commentary on many topical aspects of higher education worldwide.

Let me close with these last few comments. In dealing with the evaluation of foreign credentials here in the United States, what we find ourselves doing is taking the credentials of a particular individual who has earned a certain credential in a given country at a particular time and attempting to place that individual within the U.S. system of education at this time for a particular purpose. To do that, we need the luck of the Irish, the detective skills of a Sherlock Holmes, the wisdom of Solomon, (sounds international, doesn't it?), the patience of a saint, the courage of a Medal of Honor winner, the hide of a rhinoceros, and the strength of our convictions - all of which must be available and utilized today, because the individual has a job interview tomorrow, or has just been admitted and needs to register tomorrow.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Sources of Foreign Credential Interpretation," Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1977.

2. Open Doors/1977-78. New York: Institute of International Education, 1979, p. 3.

3. Cieslak, Edward C. "The Historical Background of Cross-Cultural Contacts on the Student Level in the United States." In The Foreign Student in American Colleges: A Survey and Evaluation of Administrative Problems and Practices. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1958, p. 6.

4. Open Doors/1977-78, p. 3.

5. World Population Growth and Response 1964-1975: A Decade of Global Action. Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau, 1976, p. 180.

6. Open Doors/1972: Report on International Educational Exchange. New York: Institute of International Education, 1972, p. 14.

7. "The Admission of Foreign Students to the United States," School and Society, Vol.XVIII, March 24, 1923, p. 322.

8. Kandel, I.L. "Educational Equivalents for Foreign Students." School and Society, Vol.LXV, June 1, 1947, p. 420.

9. Methods of Establishing Equivalences between Degrees and Diplomas. Paris: UNESCO, 1970, pp. 12-13.

10. Sharp, Theodore. The Glossary of Foreign Educational Terms. Alhambra, California: Frank Severy Publishing Company, 1979, title page.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

College and University: The Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

Commonwealth Universities Yearbook. London: Association of Commonwealth Universities, 1977.

Fisher, Claudine E. A Bibliography of Reference Materials for Evaluating Foreign Student Credentials. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers and Agency for International Development, 1974.

The International Encyclopedia of Higher Education. Asa S. Knowles, Editor-in-Chief. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1977.

International Handbook of Universities. 7th Ed. New York: DeGruyter, 1978.

"Placement Guides to Accompany U.S. Office of Education Publications," XXIII guides. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

Sasnett, Martena, and Sepmeyer, Inez. Educational Systems of Africa. Berkely, California: University of California Press, 1966.

Sharp, Theodore. The Glossary. Alhambra, California: Frank Severy Publishing Company, 1979.

Sharp, Theodore, Sepmeyer, Inez, and Sasnett, Martena. The Country Index: Interpretations for Use in the Evaluation of Foreign Secondary Academic Credentials. Alhambra, California: Frank Severy Publishing Company, 1971.

"Studies of Education in Other Countries," XC Studies. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Comparative Education Branch, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Workshop Reports. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

World Guide to Higher Education: A Comparative Survey of Systems, Degrees and Qualifications. Paris: UNESCO, 1976.

World Education Series. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

PART II

SUMMARIES OF PANEL DISCUSSIONS

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS - UNDERGRADUATE STUDY

Solveig M. Turner and Steven Bissell

The major themes of the undergraduate panel were: (1) Institutional policies on foreign student admission and (2) Evaluation practices.

INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES ON FOREIGN STUDENT ADMISSION

The workshop began with a discussion of the need for institutional policies in regard to matters such as the optimum number of foreign students desirable on any one campus and the need for a balanced geographical distribution of foreign students. A few of the participants reported specific policies in this respect. Wellesley College follows a policy of geographical diversity for its student body and uses financial aid to encourage a desirable geographical mix. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in 1972, established a University Committee to exercise control over the number of foreign students and their geographical and subject distribution. The MIT foreign student enrollment has been set at 6% of the total institutional enrollment and all qualified applicants are accepted within that quota. Northeastern University has just concluded a one-year Task Force Report on Foreign Students to determine the costs and benefits of a large foreign student contingent.

Most of the institutions, however, reported no set policy on foreign student enrollments. The lack of specific policy guidelines has sometimes led to very high enrollments from certain countries or regions and to financial problems through bureaucratic delays in payments for those institutions accepting large numbers of students from one country that later experienced war or internal turmoil. It was suggested that in order to avoid later problems, financial questions should be settled prior to sending out "I-20" forms. Some U.S. institutions have recently required full payment of one year's expenses prior to arrival for students from certain countries, particularly Iran and Nigeria.

COMMUNICATION WITH FOREIGN APPLICANTS

For questions on modes of communication with foreign applicants, the discussion centered on the need for separate university brochures and information materials for foreign students. Ideally, application forms and procedures should be tailor-made to each individual country. Although costs generally prohibit such individualized treatment, most institutions are providing information brochures and admissions forms specifically designed for foreign students. It is important that the materials stress admissions criteria and that terminology, such as "qualified students", be carefully explained (specific grade averages or diplomas or specific skills) so that the foreign applicants can exercise self-selection.

Strong faculty-admissions-alumni-native student communications lines were recommended. For instance, foreign alumni can be of assistance in interviewing foreign applicants and in determining standards of sending schools. Foreign faculty on campus and U.S. faculty with language skills and foreign educational experience also can assist in determining standards of foreign high schools and in interpreting student records.

Participants stressed the importance of on-the spot interviews of potential foreign students to assess language ability, general educational background, and maturity but also cautioned against the use of any but firmly established agencies, such as IIE and AMIDEAST, for independent interviews.

TESTING/EXAMINATIONS

For discussion of this topic see p. 39.

EVALUATIONS PRACTICES

The most prevalent questions were concerned with the evaluation of foreign secondary education in terms of U.S. admissions requirements: what foreign certificates and diplomas to accept; when and how to admit with advanced standing; how to assess previous foreign study for transfer credit; and how to compensate for a lack of subjective and comparative data on foreign transcripts. Other problems noted were a lack of information on the course content and weekly time requirements for the subjects studied and unfamilar grading systems on the transcripts. Within the time constraints of the Conference none of these questions could be dealt with in great detail.

WHAT CERTIFICATES AND DIPLOMAS TO ACCEPT

Generally, successful completion of a 12-year elementary/secondary cycle with the appropriate certificates and diplomas to testify to such success can be considered equal to a U.S. high school completion (with the exceptions mentioned below). A rule of thumb is that students who are eligible for university entry in their home country can be considered eligible for college admission in the U.S. Listings of the appropriate secondary school certificates and diplomas can be found in reference works, such as The International Encyclopedia of Higher Education, The International Handbook of Universities, The Commonwealth Universities Yearbook, World Guide to Higher Education, NAFSA's Workshop Reports, and the country studies in the World Education Series, among others. (Editor's note: Full references to these source materials may be found in the Bibliography.)

It is important to note that in some systems only the academic streams lead to university admission and the U.S. evaluator thus is left with the

problem of interpreting diplomas and certificates from technical and vocational programs and determining whether to accept such credentials for U.S. admission. The above mentioned reference works will provide guidance for the beginning evaluator and experience will then tell how admissions criteria in other countries can be modified to suit the particular U.S. institution. In cases of doubt, applicants can be requested to provide course outlines or submit to an interview with the appropriate faculty in the contested area of study.

WHEN AND HOW TO AWARD ADVANCED STANDING CREDIT

Many of the questions referred to the "superiority" of foreign educational systems: whether admission with advanced standing is to be based on blanket credit for certain graduates because of the "superiority" of their national system. The discussion centered on the fact that foreign systems of education are not superior, they are just different. Some systems of education require more in-depth study of a few subjects, more contact hours for specific subjects, or an additional year for secondary graduation, which allows more detailed coverage of certain areas of study. Twelve years of primary/secondary education (in a variety of combinations) generally is the minimum for university admission in most countries. The International Encyclopedia of Higher Education contains up-to-date descriptions of the first two levels of education in the section "Relationship with Secondary Education" in each of its country descriptions. Similar information is found in the World Guide to Higher Education and in the different country studies in the World Education Series.

Blanket credit of 1-2 years for secondary school completion for all applicants from a specific country or institution is not to be recommended unless the admitting U.S. institution has determined from experience that secondary school completion in that specific country or institution is at its junior level regardless of the quality of the applicants' grades. In all other cases, the applicant's success should be evaluated individually. Most standard evaluation guides recommend advanced standing credit of some 6-10 credits for each subject successfully completed at the GCE "A" level in Commonwealth countries if the student also has the appropriate number of "O" level examinations, commonly, five GCE subjects with at least two at "A" level. (Students with five "O" level passes in academic subjects can be accepted at the freshman level.) The same generally applies to the specific subjects tested in the baccalauréat (France and other francophone countries) noting that humanities graduates under the French system generally do not qualify for advanced standing in science subjects or for admission as science majors. More background information on the two types of systems can be found in the recent volumes France (1975) and United Kingdom (1976) in the World Education Series. Another good source on the British system -- especially on the different types of non-university qualifications-- is Barbara Priestley's

British Qualifications, III ed., (London: Kogan Page, 1972) as well as the bi-annual Higher Education in the United Kingdom (The British Council, 10 Spring Gardens, London SW1A 2BN), and the annual Directory of First Degree Courses (Council for National Academic Awards, Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X BBP). Background information and placement recommendations for the francophone and anglophone systems in Africa can be found in NAFSA's Workshop Report on Sub-Saharan African countries.

Admission with advanced standing also can be considered for successfully completed subjects in secondary systems that require a 13-year cycle for secondary graduation, such as those of Germany, Iceland, Italy, and Sweden's four-year secondary program. Students from systems which, although requiring only 12 years of study, require a GCE-type final examination with subsequent in-depth study of the tested subjects: Austria, Denmark, Finland, and Norway, also qualify for the award of advanced standing if student's level of achievement is high.

Advanced standing also can be considered when the applicant has completed a 2-3 year program of study that bridges the last year(s) of high school and the first year(s) of post-secondary education. Examples of this type of program are the Canadian collèges d'enseignement général et professionnelle in Quebec, the British City and Guilds of London Institute technological certificates, the British Ordinary National Certificates and Diplomas, and the Higher National Certificates and Diplomas, as well as Associateships awarded by professional associations in Commonwealth countries. In each case the evaluator should carefully determine the exact level of study based on syllabi and other supportive materials and if not available, rely on examinations such as S.A.T. or on faculty interviews.

HOW TO ASSESS PREVIOUS FOREIGN STUDY FOR TRANSFER CREDIT

Among problems in this area are the following: (1) In most countries, study in post-secondary institutions is not assessed by credit hours as in the U.S.; (2) information is rarely available on the content of study, i.e., syllabi and course outlines; and (3) the foreign distinction between non-university institutions and university institutions sometimes is confusing. It is a well-known fact that all German university professors agree that there is an important distinction between courses in the German Fachhochschulen, which admit their students after 12 years of previous education, and the German universities which require 13 years for entry. The question is: how important is that distinction in the U.S. where students may enter junior colleges, four-year colleges, or universities, and then transfer freely among these institutions? Similarly, should the evaluator make a quality distinction between courses in the British (and other Commonwealth) polytechnics and in the universities? As usual, the evaluator has to assess a number of criteria, such as the admitting institution's own general admissions criteria, the success level of the

foreign applicant, and the amount of primary/secondary education he/she achieved prior to entry into the secondary/post-secondary course, as well as the general reputation of the institution and, if available, information about course content and standards. Faculty input generally is helpful in all doubtful cases.

Most recognized post-secondary institutions and their admissions criteria are listed in the earlier mentioned reference works. Foreign institutions admitting on the same level as the evaluator's institution pose little problem: if available information (course catalogs, course description provided by the institution) seems to indicate the same standards as those of the admitting institution, transfer credit is justified. The difficulty comes in evaluating programs, such as those of non-university institutions that sometimes require less than completed secondary school for entry. Careful use of recommended reference sources, study of course content and, if possible, a faculty interview are of assistance to the evaluator. When considering credit for laboratory courses, caution is generally recommended as equipment in many cases is not up to U.S. standards.

The number of credits to be awarded for previous foreign study often can be determined by counting the number of contact hours(often noted on transcript or grade sheet) weekly or for the whole semester or year. Thus, one hour weekly for the semester can be equated to one U.S.credit hour; a total of 150 hours for the semester or year can be translated into 10 credits. However, one question that is difficult to determine is whether the student actually attended the courses in question. It is quite common in some systems for students to register for a course in the fall and not attend the course again until the final examination in the spring. Monitoring attendance probably is not even necessary in this day of experiential credits -- if the student has passed the final examination, it may not matter how he or she has acquired mastery of the subject matter.

Some of the participating institutions reported having established separate admissions committees for foreign student admissions and including a number of faculty with international expertise on the committees. The experience with such committees so far has been favorable.

It was recommended that each foreign student be given an "evaluation certificate" to be completed by all of the student's teachers, which could then be returned to the admissions office and provide needed feedback on the success of each foreign student.

LACK OF SUBJECTIVE AND COMPARATIVE DATA

Foreign secondary school transcripts often do not give comparative information about the applicant, such as rank in class or the extent of

extracurricular activities. During the morning session it was pointed out that most foreign applicants have graduated from elite systems of education, succeeding through increasingly competitive examinations along the way to the secondary school certificate. Most also sit for standardized national examinations or externally evaluated secondary examinations. Each individual's success thus is already measured on a national level and reflected in the achieved grades. This rigorous academic background prepares the successful foreign students for continued academic success. Rank in class also is less important when realizing that many foreign institutions graduate very small classes. Extracurricular activities, such as work on school newspapers or radio, sports activities, or drama, commonly are not available in most systems and rarely are criteria considered when admitting to the university in the home country.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS - GRADUATE STUDY

Solveig M. Turner and Beverly LaSonde

The major themes for the discussion of the graduate panel were: (1) The evaluation process itself: verification of the authenticity of foreign educational credentials; the assessment in U.S. terms of the level of education achieved abroad; determination of transfer credits; interpretation of foreign grading systems; and the evaluation of foreign letters of recommendation. (2) The assessment of the academic standing and reputation of foreign institutions. (3) Determination of English-language skills of applicants prior to arrival. (4) The need for consistency among institutions in evaluations for professional licensing.

HOW TO VERIFY THE AUTHENTICITY OF FOREIGN EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS

Many participants were interested in learning how to recognize false credentials and how to establish the authenticity of documents. The number of students admitted with false credentials may be minimized by adhering to certain rules: (1) By routinely requiring transcripts to be sent directly from overseas institutions to the admitting U.S. institution. (U.S. students are expected to submit official transcripts: there is thus no reason for foreign students not to follow the same procedure.) Although problems are sometimes encountered (refugees, lack of response from institutions in countries undergoing war and upheavals), most foreign institutions will send transcripts (in various forms) on request by a U.S. institution; (2) By asking to see the original documents rather than xerox copies before admitting a foreign student; and (3) By carefully inspecting all documents. General Certificate of Education (GCE) certificates are especially easy to alter. Changes in GCE certificates are commonly made in three different ways: (1) By adding subjects passed; (2) by changing grades; and (3) by substituting the graduate's name. In most cases, careful scrutiny of the document will reveal different typefaces, uneven lines, or outlines of the tape used to cover the original computer lines. (For further information, see the paper Forged Educational Credentials: A Sorry Tale by Stephen Fisher (President, World Education Services, New York), and W. J. Dey (former Secretary, University of London).

Conference participants also raised questions concerning the lack of credentials of refugees or other persons not able to secure original documentation. Several solutions were suggested by participants. Some institutions have located faculty members able to vouch for the background of the applicant; in other cases, admissions officers have had to rely on results of standardized tests, such as GRE, SAT, GNAT, etc., or on the personal evaluations of faculty in the admitting department.

The translations of documents often leave much to be desired. Translations should be accompanied by the appropriate originals to enable verification of their authenticity. Translations should be officially certified by the appropriate

Consulate, Embassy, notary public, or generally reputable translation agency to minimize translation mistakes. Participants noted that most colleges and universities in Massachusetts have valuable translation resources in their international faculty and staff. Northeastern University, for instance, recently concluded a directory of the foreign ties of its faculty and staff, including their language capabilities, and noted that they spoke 50 languages, ranging from Finnish to Urdu. Similar language skills are found and can be tapped in other area institutions in cases of questionable translations. Very often words such as "bachelor's degree," "master's degree," and "high school diploma", are used freely by translators unfamiliar with the proper educational terminology, however, such a determination should be left to the evaluator. As stated in the morning discussion, certain foreign terms are invaluable for the evaluator and knowledge of them simplifies the evaluation task. Educational glossaries, such as those found in The International Encyclopedia of Higher Education, Glossaire International, The Glossary of Foreign Terms, and the World Guide to Higher Education, are helpful tools for the evaluator. Most of the books in the ACCRAO World Education Series also contain valuable glossary material.

HOW TO ASSESS IN U.S. TERMS THE LEVEL OF EDUCATION ACHIEVED ABROAD

The morning presentations warned against determining equivalency of degrees and diplomas by relying solely on factors such as the length of the study period or common terminology. A first degree, in some countries called a diploma or professional qualification, requiring some four to five years of study, ordinarily can be considered equal to a U.S. bachelor's degree although the levels of specialization for a first degree vary substantially from country to country. Most countries do not adhere to the U.S. practice of general undergraduate education followed by specialization and instead require immediate specialization. The subject thus is covered in more depth. In this regard the British honours B.A. degree was mentioned prominently. Requiring four years of highly specialized study, the degree often can be considered equal to a U.S. master's degree.

Similarly, participants agreed that although some first degrees or titles often require five years of study - for instance, the Latin American licenciatura, the Italian laurea - the level of preparation more accurately can be evaluated as a U.S. bachelor's degree. One interesting aspect can be mentioned regarding the licenciatura: A person who has completed all course work for the licenciatura, but not the required thesis or project is known as an egresado (literally "one who has left at the termination of school") but he/she has notgraduated with a diploma or title. An egresado with acceptable grades can be considered to have achieved the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree, as most U.S. institutions do not require a thesis for the first degree. On the other hand, the highly specialized five-year diplomas awarded in the USSR and other Eastern European countries denote high achievement and ordinarily can be considered equal to a U.S. master's degree.

Most doctoral degrees the world over - whether awarded as a result of course work/examinations/dissertation or by research/dissertation and varying in duration of study - denote a high level of specialization and achievement. Yet, because of the varying requirements, it is difficult to assess whether a doctorate in one country is exactly equivalent to a doctorate in another. One practical (and lazy) solution is to state that if a scholar has been awarded a doctorate in one country he/she can be considered to hold the same qualification in another country, whether or not the precise content of studies for the doctorate or the exact level or qualifications are equivalent. A different type of problem for the U.S. evaluator is posed by the second doctoral degree awarded by institutions in the USSR and other Eastern European countries and for which there is no U.S. equivalent, for instance, the doctor nauk (USSR), doctor docent in stiinte (Romania), doctor of science (German Democratic Republic). These degrees denote a high level of post-doctoral achievement.

In many of the above cases, a certain consistency can be achieved by following the placement guidelines recommended by AACRAO's World Education Series, NAFSA's Workshop Reports, and other standard reference sources. (See Bibliography).

Many participants noted that it is important for each individual institution to maintain records of the successes or failures of students it accepts from various countries, thereby providing a source of information on the true level of preparation of students from that country in terms of the accepting institution's own academic standards. Especially noted in the discussion was that Harvard's Graduate School of Arts and Sciences has established its own record of admissions recommendations, which is updated periodically. By maintaining a continuing record of acceptable and unacceptable degrees, diplomas, and certificates by country, and of the success of the respective students, the School of Arts and Sciences is able to standardize its evaluations procedures and efficiently train new staff members for the evaluation task, which in most institutions requires a long period of trial and error.

DETERMINATION OF TRANSFER CREDITS

If it is difficult to determine the level of a completed foreign degree, an even more demanding task is to decide whether or not to award transfer credits. This was one of the more common questions for the panel.

If the evaluator does not have access to a catalog or a course syllabus, (CIHED has available university catalogs from a number of countries and makes those catalogs available to evaluators from sister institutions), but has been able to determine that the institution from which transfer credit is sought is a post-secondary institution recognized by the authorities in the home country - ministries,

Department of Education, University Grants Committee, or other such agencies or bodies - the completed courses might be considered for transfer credit. Generally one-clock-hour-per-week for a semester can be equated to one semester credit. It is important to note that in many countries the academic year is not divided into semesters or quarters and the course consequently will run for a full year, so that a 3-hour-per-week course for one academic year actually translates into 6 semester credits for the year.

Students will always tend to state that the level of study at the foreign institution was much higher, the hours expended in home work much longer, etc., and that more transfer credits thus are needed. In cases of doubt, it might be valuable to allow the student to prove his/her case by attempting an examination - written or oral - in the subject, a worthwhile procedure in that clearly unqualified students thus will not be admitted into more demanding courses.

The main point to remember is that one year at a foreign institution is not worth more than one year at a U.S. institution, and that the award of 1 to 2 years of blanket credit without considering the student's major in his/her home country or at the U.S. institution might place both the U.S. institution and the student at a disadvantage. Also, in view of the previous comments on foreign grading, the specific grade, A-C, for a course is not as important as whether or not the contested courses have been completed with a passing grade.

HOW TO UNDERSTAND DIFFERENT GRADING SYSTEMS

In most countries the grading processes are quite stringent, and those who graduate from the - mostly elite - foreign systems exhibit a high level of achievement.

Two common problems faced by evaluators are: to understand the grading system used; and to determine the standard of grading, i.e., the level of the applicant's achievement.

Consensus was that many foreign systems use the middle grade range more than is customary in the U.S. There are fewer "straight A's" and more C-B's.

Typically, grading systems vary both among and within countries. To assist evaluators, transcripts or grade reports contain a key to the grading. It might be in small type, but it is usually there. There are only so many ways to grade: letter grades, numerical grades, or verbal grades. Verbal grades extend from excellent (distinction) through very good, good, satisfactory, poor, failure. If the suggestions regarding translations have been followed, the evaluator will probably be facing a translation indicating some variation of the above verbal grades. If a translation is lacking, or not clear enough, the earlier mentioned

glossaries (or the appropriate faculty members) may be consulted for a clarification of the meaning of the grades. Very often the verbal grades are accompanied by numerical grades. There is a wide variety of numerical grading systems: 1-20 with 10 passing (France, many Latin American countries); 1-10 with 5 passing (some Latin American and some European countries); 1-5 with 1 the highest grade and 5 a failure (Germany), or 5-1 with 5 the top grade and 1-2 a failure (Germany, Sweden). In many cases, the grade is clearly indicated as in 3.5/4; 2.5/3 (Finland) which means that 4 or 3 respectively indicate the highest mark obtainable; or 12/20; 15/20 a way of marking French grades; the 20 again indicating the highest possible grade. Incidentally, 12/20 and 13/20 are very common and acceptable grades; rarely seen are grades such as 17/20 and 18/20.

Below are some additional examples of grading systems:

University of Lagos (Nigeria)

70 and above	A (First class honours)
60-69	B+ (Second class honours, upper division)
50-59	B (Second class honours, lower division)
40-49	C (Third class honours)
33-39	D (Failure, but pass mark in engineering)
Below 33	E (Failure in engineering)

University of Alexandria (Egypt)

85-100	distinction
75-84	very good
65-74	good
60-64	pass

In both examples the A-range is wider than that of the U.S, but not as common.

Lenin Moscow State Pedagogical Institute

Excellent	(A)
Good	(B)
Satisfactory	(C)
Credit	(C-)

Indian transcripts normally indicate the range for the marks awarded - from minimum to maximum - which is quite helpful as the range of numbers on any one transcript vary. There might be a minimum grade of 20 for one course but a total of 800-1000 as an overall percentage of the aggregate marks for a full degree. Important to note is that the minimum for "A's" varies from 60-65%, the minimum for passing generally is 33% or 36%.

U.S. evaluators often find the Indian grading into Division I, II, and III, especially perplexing, however, the terms are helpful in interpreting the various aggregate numbers. Typically, a Division I grade requires a success percentage

of 60-65% or higher; Division II, 45-48% or higher; Division III, 33-36% or higher.

Since the grade variations on Indian credentials are considerable the evaluator has to rely very much on the applicant's chronological educational record, previous experience with Indian credentials, and available standard placement guides.

EVALUATION OF LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

As is the case with letters of recommendations in the U.S., foreign letters of recommendation generally place the applicant in the best possible light, and should be read carefully with an eye to the actual scholastic accomplishment of the applicant. Sometimes, however, there is a bias against the applicant, "a damning with faint praise" of which the evaluator must be aware. One panel member had noted such discrepancies in the case of female and male students from the same Mid-Eastern institution. Recommendations were made by the same professors. The male applicants received recommendations, such as "excellent candidate for a higher degree," while the female candidates rated "very good" or "good." In several cases, careful scrutiny of transcripts revealed that the female candidates had received consistently higher grades in their courses, and subsequently had up to 0.5 higher QPA than the male applicants.

ASSESSING THE ACADEMIC STANDING AND REPUTATION OF FOREIGN INSTITUTIONS

Accreditation by external agencies, such as in the U.S., is not common in other countries, where standards more often are maintained by government agencies or government-appointed independent bodies.

Educational standards vary over the years from institution to institution, from professor to professor. For the foreign institutions as for the U.S. institutions the quality of an institution or a program is difficult to assess. As a rule of thumb, an institution that has existed for a great number of years, has a substantial enrollment and a large full-time faculty can be expected to adhere to strict standards. Many of the national universities in Central and South America and the oldest universities in Africa and Asia belong in this category. The state-run universities in Europe, both East and West, adhere to strict government guidelines in curricula and standards as well, and can be compared to be best institutions in the U.S.

Information on founding dates, programs, enrollments, full- and part-time faculty, language of instruction, and degrees can be found in reference sources such as the International Handbook of Universities and the Commonwealth Universities Yearbook. Among other major reference works, The International Encyclopedia of Higher Education covers the history of educational institutions,

their programs, and degrees, while the World of Learning lists enrollments, founding dates, language of instruction, and the faculties and departments offering programs. These reference works include only government-approved or maintained institutions and thus help to identify approved institutions.

DETERMINATION OF ENGLISH-LANGUAGE SKILLS OF APPLICANTS PRIOR TO ARRIVAL AT THE UNIVERSITY *

The question of how to assess English-language proficiency was brought up by a number of participants, and discussion centered on available measurements: the TOEFL, other standard measurements such as the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency, the ALIGU Test, and the CELT, and individual institutions' testing materials including interviews and other subjective criteria. Among suggestions for refining institutions' methods of determining language proficiency it was agreed that there are both advantages and disadvantages in utilizing the services of foreign alumni to assess language skills of applicants by way of personal interviews.

In the absence of a multi-measurement policy including an on-the-spot interview, determination of a candidate's English-language proficiency by means of a paper-and-pencil test only is tenuous at best. The TOEFL, for example, gives information about a student's aural and reading and writing skills, yet even students with scores as high as 550 on the TOEFL sometimes have problems understanding and speaking English in the American environment. Most of the participants agreed that students with scores below 500 should not be recommended for direct admission.

It was stressed that, whatever measurements are used, it is crucial that test data be interpreted in the light of other information about the student. It is important to consider the student's major and his/her level of studies, and the minimal level of proficiency for fulfilment of course requirements in the particular field, and to take into account the student's individual skills in English. If his/her reading and vocabulary skills are highly developed but the spoken skills are weak, how will this affect performance, and what services can be offered to help the student? The evaluator also must be able to anticipate the degree to which the student will be able to continue to develop his/her language skills after arrival, by considering the student's first language, the circumstances under which he/she reached the present level of proficiency, his/her motivation and aptitude for language learning in this particular situation. Most importantly, what resources will be available to support the further language development of the student?

---

* The cooperation of Ann Hilferty, Director, English as a Second Language Program, Northeastern University is acknowledged.

In the absence of clear indicators of the level of language proficiency prior to arrival, it was suggested that applicants be accepted conditionally pending satisfaction of the language requirements, and when necessary, that they be advised to undertake additional study in a language program at the institution itself or at an affiliated institution.

In addition to a clearly-articulated plan for assessing students' language proficiency as precisely as possible it was suggested that an important next step is a well-organized, well-informed advising and support structure for the entering students. Planning course sequences which will ease students gradually into those courses which will make the most demands on their language abilities, informing students of support services in English as a Second Language (ESL), and recommending reduced academic loads when appropriate, are some examples of the followup which can make the promise of the high language proficiency test score come true.

The various academic departments, as well as the Foreign Students Office and the administrative offices, can help facilitate the student's adjustment after enrollment with field-specific services such as orientations for teaching assistants in the various fields, special introductions to such conventions as the case study method in graduate business programs, and English tutoring offered by people familiar with the subject matter of the student's major field.

The College Entrance Examination Board has prepared a booklet on the understanding and interpretation of TOEFL scores, TOEFL-Test and Score Manual, which can be ordered from Test of English as a Foreign Language, Box 899, Princeton, NJ 08541. The TOEFL Program Office recommends that only score reports distributed directly from ETS be accepted for admission.

THE NEED FOR CONSISTENCY AMONG INSTITUTIONS IN EVALUATIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL LICENSING

The importance of accuracy and consistency in evaluations for licensing was stressed by the government panelists. Although clear rules are laid down by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts regarding the requirements for the licensing of foreign teachers, those rules can be compromised by an incorrect evaluation at a different level. As an example, if a graduate department of education admits an Italian applicant who has graducted from a scuola magistrale, (a secondary-level teacher training institution) on the assumption that the applicant has completed four years of teacher training comparable to four years in a U.S. college or university, and subsequently awards the Italian applicant a master's degree, the Italian teacher can be certified as a teacher in Massachusetts. After completing three years as a teacher in Massachusetts, the Italian teacher then qualifies for certification in an additional 30 states in the U.S. All on the basis of a secondary school diploma (evaluated as a bachelor's degree) and a master's degree!

Such mistakes are common and highly embarrassing to U.S. higher education given the idea that master's degree programs should indicate a higher level of subject mastery than a bachelor's degree. It is also unfair to U.S. teachers and, possibly, also the students.

Another common mistake among area universities has been to admit an applicant from a French-language country into a master's program based upon his or her baccalauréat diploma. The problems outlined above again are applicable. Most other professions that require their members to be licensed face the same problems. Admission of a student without proper undergraduate training into master's programs militates against one of the reasons for the existence of credentials: to protect the public from obviously unqualified individuals.

The most important aspect in the licensing procedure for foreign teachers, however is to reach a consistency in evaluations among area institutions so that all applicants from the same country adhere to the same standards. Lately, the lack of consistency seems to have been more of a problem at the graduate than at the undergraduate level.

PART III

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

ED-78/CONF.215/4 Prov.
PARIS, 15 December 1978
Original: English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF GOVERNMENTAL EXPERTS RESPONSIBLE FOR PREPARING A DRAFT CONVENTION ON THE RECOGNITION OF STUDIES, DIPLOMAS AND DEGREES CONCERNING HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE STATES BELONGING TO THE EUROPE REGION

Paris, 11-15 December 1978

DRAFT CONVENTION ON THE RECOGNITION OF STUDIES, DIPLOMAS AND DEGREES CONCERNING HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE STATES BELONGING TO THE EUROPE REGION

The States of the Europe region, Parties to this Convention,

Recalling that, as the General Conference of Unesco has noted on several occasions in its resolutions concerning European co-operation, "the development of co-operation between nations in the fields of education, science, culture and communication, in accordance with the principles set out in Unesco's Constitution, plays an essential role in the promotion of peace and international understanding",

Conscious of the close relationship that exists between their cultures, despite their diversity of languages and the differences in economic and social systems, and desiring to strengthen their co-operation in the field of education and training in the interests of the well-being and lasting prosperity of their peoples,

Recalling that the States meeting in Helsinki expressed, in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (31 July 1975), their intention "to improve access, under mutually acceptable conditions, for students, teachers and scholars of the participating States to each other's educational, cultural and scientific institutions ... in particular by ... arriving at the mutual recognition of academic degrees and diplomas either through governmental agreements, where necessary, or direct arrangements between universities and other institutions of higher learning and research",

Recalling that, with a view to promoting the attainment of these objectives, most of the Contracting States have already concluded bilateral or subregional agreements among themselves concerning the equivalence or recognition of diplomas, but desiring, while pursuing and intensifying their efforts at the bilateral and subregional levels, to extend their co-operation in this field to the whole Europe region,

Convinced that the great diversity of higher education systems in the Europe region constitutes an exceptionally rich cultural asset which should be preserved, and desiring to enable all their peoples to benefit fully from this rich cultural asset by facilitating access by the inhabitants of each Contracting State to the educational resources of the other Contracting States, more especially by authorizing them to continue their education in higher educational institutions in those other States,

Considering that the system of equivalence of diplomas and degrees which prevailed in the past for the admission of foreign students was based on a concept of strict equality of value which no longer corresponds to the complexity and diversity of present-day education systems and that, to authorize admission to further stages of study, the more flexible concept of the recognition of studies should be employed, a concept which, in a context of social and international mobility, makes it possible to evaluate the level of education reached bearing in mind knowledge acquired, as attested by diplomas and degrees obtained and also the individual's other relevant qualifications, so far as these may be deemed acceptable by competent authorities,

Considering that the recognition by all the Contracting States of studies, certificates, diplomas and degrees obtained in any one of them is intended to develop the international mobility of persons and the exchange of ideas, knowledge and scientific and technological experience, and that it would be desirable to accept foreign students into establishments of higher education on the understanding that recognition of their studies or diplomas shall at no time confer on them greater rights than those enjoyed by national students,

Noting that this recognition constitutes one of the conditions necessary for:

1. enabling means of education existing in their territories to be used as effectively as possible,

2. ensuring that teachers, students, research workers and professional workers have greater mobility,

3. alleviating the difficulties encountered on their return by persons who have been trained or educated abroad,

Desiring to ensure that studies, certificates, diplomas and degrees are recognized as widely as possible, taking into account the principles of the promotion of lifelong education, the democratization of education, and the adoption and application of an education policy allowing for structural, economic, technological and social changes and suited to the cultural context of each country,

Determined to sanction and organize their future collaboration in these matters by means of a convention which will be the starting point for concerted dynamic action taken in particular by means of national, bilateral, subregional and multilateral machinery already existing or that may be deemed necessary,

Mindful that the ultimate objective set by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization consists in "preparing an international convention on the recognition and the validity of degrees, diplomas and certificates issued by establishments of higher learning and research in all countries",

Have agreed as follows:

I. DEFINITIONS

Article 1

1. For the purpose of this Convention, the "recognition" of a foreign certificate, diploma or degree of higher education means its acceptance as a valid credential by the competent authorities in a Contracting State and the granting to its holder of rights enjoyed by persons who possess a national certificate, diploma or degree with which the foreign one is asscessed as comparable.

Recognition is further defined as follows:

(a) Recognition of a certificate, diploma or degree with a view to undertaking or pursuing studies at the higher level shall enable the holder to be considered for entry to the higher educational and research institutions of any Contracting State under the same conditions as regards studies as those applying to the holders of a similar certificate, diploma or degree issued in the Contracting State concerned. Such recognition does not exempt the holder of the foreign certificate, diploma or degree from complying with any conditions (other than those relating to the holding of a diploma) which may be required for admission by the higher educational or research institution concerned of the receiving State.

(b) Recognition of a foreign certificate, diploma or degree with a view to the practice of a profession is recognition of the professional preparation of the holder for the practice of the profession concerned, unless the regulations in a Contracting State provide otherwise. Such recognition does not exempt the holder of the foreign certificate, diploma or degree from complying with any conditions for the practice of the profession concerned which may be laid down by the competent governmental or professional authorities.

(c) Recognition of a certificate, diploma or degree should not entitle the holder to more rights in another State than he would enjoy in the country in which it was awarded.

2. For the purposes of this Convention:

(a) "Secondary education" means that stage of education of any kind which follows the primary or basic stage and which may include among its aims that of preparing pupils for admission to higher education.

(b) "Higher education" means education, training and research at the post-secondary level.

3. For the purposes of this Convention, "partial studies" means periods of study or training which while not constituting a complete course are such that they add significantly to the acquisition of knowledge or skills.

II. AIMS

Article 2

1. The Contracting States intend to contribute through their joint action both to the promotion of the active co-operation of all the countries of the Europe region in the cause of peace and international understanding and to the development of more effective collaboration with other Member States of Unesco with regard to a more comprehensive use of their educational, technological and scientific potential.

2. The Contracting States solemnly declare their firm resolve within the framework of their legislation and constitutional structures to co-operate closely with a view to:

(a) enabling the educational and research resources available to them to be used as effectively as possible in the interests of all the Contracting States, and, for this purpose:

(i) to make their higher educational institutions as widely accessible as possible to students or researchers from any of the Contracting States;

(ii) to recognize the studies, certificates, diplomas and degrees of such persons;

(iii) to examine the possibility of elaborating and adopting similar terminology and evaluation criteria which would facilitate the application of a system which will ensure the comparability of credits, subjects of study and certificates, diplomas and degrees;

(iv) to adopt a dynamic approach in matters of admission to further stages of study, bearing in mind knowledge acquired, as attested by certificates, diplomas and degrees, and also the individual's other relevant qualifications, so far as these may be deemed acceptable by competent authorities;

(v) to adopt flexible criteria for the evaluation of partial studies, based on the educational level reached and on the content of the courses taken, bearing in mind the interdisciplinary character of knowledge at higher education level;

(vi) to improve the system for the exchange of information regarding the recognition of studies, certificates, diplomas and degrees;

(b) constantly improving curricula in the Contracting States and methods of planning and promoting higher education, on the basis of not only the requirements for economic, social and cultural development, the policies of each country and also the objectives that are set out in the recommendations made by the competent organs of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization concerning the continuous improvement of the quality of education, the promotion of lifelong education and the democratization of education, but also the aims of the full development of the human personality and of understanding, tolerance and friendship among nations and in general all aims concerning human rights assigned to education by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the United Nations International Covenants on Human Rights and the Unesco Convention Against Discrimination in Education;

(c) promoting regional and world-wide co-operation in the matter of the recognition of studies and academic qualifications.

3. The Contracting States agree to take all feasible steps at the national, bilateral and multilateral levels, in particular by means of bilateral, subregional, regional or other agreements, arrangements between universities or other higher educational institutions and arrangements with the competent national or international organizations and other bodies, with a view to the progressive attainment of the goals defined in the present article.

III. UNDERTAKINGS FOR IMMEDIATE APPLICATION

Article 3

1. The Contracting States agree to give recognition, as defined in Article 1, paragraph 1 to secondary school leaving certificate and other diplomas issued

in the other Contracting States that grant access to higher education with a view to enabling the holders to undertake studies in institutions of higher education situated in the respective territories of the Contracting States.

2. Admission to a given higher educational institution may, however, be dependent on the availability of places and also on the conditions concerning linguistic knowledge required in order profitably to undertake the studies in question.

Article 4

1. The Contracting States agree to take all feasible steps with a view to:

(a) giving recognition as defined in Article 1, paragraph 1 to certificates, diplomas and degrees with a view to enabling the holders to pursue advanced studies and training and undertake research in their institutions of higher education;

(b) defining, so far as possible, the procedure applicable to the recognization, for the purpose of the pursuit of studies, of the partial studies pursued in higher educational institutions situated in the other Contracting States.

2. Where admission to educational institutions in the Territory of a Contracting State is outside the control of that State, it shall transmit the text of the Convention to the institutions concerned and use its best endeavours to obtain the acceptance by the latter of the principles stated in sections II and III of the Convention.

3. The provisions of Article 3, paragraph 2 above shall apply to the cases covered by this article.

Article 5

The Contracting States agree to take all feasible steps to ensure that certificates, diplomas or degrees issued by the competent authorities of the other Contracting States are effectively recognized for the purpose of practising a profession within the meaning of Article 1, paragraph 1 (b).

Article 6

1. Considering that recognition refers to the studies followed and the certificates, diplomas or degrees obtained in the recognized institutions of a given Contracting State, any person of whatever nationality or political or legal status, who has followed such studies and obtained such certificates, diplomas or degrees shall be entitled to benefit from the provisions of Articles 3, 4 and 5.

2. Any national of a Contracting State who has obtained in the territory of a non-Contracting State one or more certificates, diplomas or degrees similar to those defined in Articles 3, 4 and 5 may avail himself of those provisions which are applicable, on condition that his certificates, diplomas or degrees have been recognized in his home country and in the country in which he wishes to continue his studies.

IV. MACHINERY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Article 7

The Contracting States shall undertake to work for the attainment of the objectives defined in Article 2 and shall make their best efforts to ensure that the undertakings set forth in Articles 3, 4 and 5 above are put into effect by means of:

(a) national bodies;

(b) the regional committee defined in Article 9;

(c) bilateral or subregional bodies.

Article 8

1. The Contracting States recognize that the attainment of the goals and the execution of the undertakings defined in this Convention will require, at the national level, close co-operation and co-ordination of the efforts of a great variety of national authorities, whether governmental or non-governmental, particularly universities, validating bodies and other educational institutions. They therefore agree to entrust the study of the problems involved in the application of this Convention to appropriate national bodies, with which all the sectors concerned will be associated and which will be empowered to propose appropriate solutions. The Contracting States will furthermore take all feasible measures required to speed up the effective functioning of these national bodies.

2. The Contracting States shall co-operate with the competent authorities of another Contracting State especially by enabling them to collect all information of use to it in its activities relating to studies, diplomas and degrees in higher education.

3. Every national body shall have at its disposal the necessary means to enable it either to collect, process and file all information of use to it in its activities relating to studies, diplomas and degrees in higher education, or to obtain the information it requires in this connection at short notice from a separate national documentation centre.

Article 9

1. A regional committee composed of representatives of the Governments of the Contracting States is hereby set up. Its Secretariat is entrusted to the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

2. Non-Contracting States of the Europe region which have been invited to take part in the diplomatic conference entrusted with the adoption of this Convention shall be able to participate in the meetings of the Regional Committee.

3. The function of the Regional Committee shall be to promote the application of this Convention. It shall receive and examine the periodic reports which the Contracting States shall communicate to it on the progress made and the obstacles encountered by them in the application of the Convention and also the studies carried out by its Secretariat on the said Convention. The Contracting States undertake to submit a report to the Committee at least once every two years.

4. The Regional Committee shall, where appropriate, address to the Contracting States recommendations of a general or individual character concerning the application of this Convention.

Article 10

1. The Regional Committee shall elect its chairman for each session and adopt its Rules of Procedure. It shall meet in ordinary session at least every two years. The Committee shall meet for the first time three months after the sixth instrument of ratification or accession has been deposited.

2. The Secretariat of the Regional Committee shall prepare the agenda for the meetings of the Committee, in accordance with the instructions it receives from the Committee and the provisions of the Rules of Procedure. It shall help national bodies to obtain the information needed by them in their activities.

V. DOCUMENTATION

Article 11

1. The Contracting States shall engage in exchanges of information and documentation pertaining to studies, certificates, diplomas and degrees in higher education.

2. They shall endeavour to promote the development of methods and machinery for collecting, processing, classifying and disseminating all the necessary information pertaining to the recognition of studies, certificates, diplomas and degrees in higher education, taking into account existing methods and machinery as well as information collected by national, subregional, regional and international bodies, in particular the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

VI. CO-OPERATION WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Article 12

The Regional Committee shall make all the appropriate arrangements for associating with its efforts, for the purpose of ensuring that this Convention is applied as fully as possible, the competent international governmental and non-governmental organizations. This applies particularly to the intergovernmental institutions and agencies vested with responsibility for the application of subregional conventions or agreements concerning the recognition of diplomas and degrees in the States belonging to the Europe region.

VII. INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF A CONTRACTING STATE BUT SITUATED OUTSIDE ITS TERRITORY

Article 13

The provisions of this Convention shall apply to studies pursued at, and to certificates, diplomas and degrees obtained from, any institution of higher education under the authority of a Contracting State, even when this institution is situated outside its territory, provided that the competent authorities in the Contracting State in which the institution is situated have no objections.

VIII. RATIFICATION, ACCESSION AND ENTRY INTO FORCE

Article 14

This Convention shall be open for signature and ratification by the States of the Europe region which have been invited to take part in the diplomatic conference entrusted with the adoption of this Convention as well as by the Holy See.

Article 15

1. Other States which are members of the United Nations, of one of the Specialized Agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency or which are Parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice may be authorized to accede to this Convention.

2. Any request to this effect shall be communicated to the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization who shall transmit it to the Contracting States at least three months before the meeting of the ad hoc committee referred to in paragraph 3 of this article.

3. The Contracting States shall meet as an ad hoc committee comprising one representative for each Contracting State, with an express mandate from his Government to consider such a request. In such cases, the decision of the committee shall require a two-thirds majority of the Contracting States.

4. This procedure shall apply only when the Convention has been ratified by at least 20 of the States referred to in Article 14.

Article 16

Ratification of this Convention or accession to it shall be effected by depositing an instrument of ratification or accession with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Article 17

This Convention shall enter into force one month after the second instrument of ratification has been deposited, but soley with respect to the States which have deposited their instruments of ratification. It shall enter into force for each other State one month after that State has deposited its instrument of ratification or accession.

Article 18

1. The Contracting States shall have the right to denounce this Convention.

2. The denunciation shall be signified by an instrument in writing deposited with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

3. The denunciation shall take effect twelve months after the instrument of denunciation has been received. However, persons having benefited from the provisions of this Convention who may be pursuing studies in the territory of the State denouncing the Convention will be able to complete the course of studies they have begun.

Article 19

The Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization shall inform the Contracting States and the other States mentioned in Articles 14 and 15 and also the United Nations of the deposit of all the instruments of ratification or accession referred to in Article 16 and the denunciations provided for in Article 18 of this Convention.

Article 20

In conformity with Article 102 of the United Nations Charter, this Convention shall be registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations at the request of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned representatives, being duly authorized thereto, have signed this Convention.

APPENDIX II

EDUCATION IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

G. James Haas

The information that follows was mainly (not entirely) gleaned from presentations made at the NAFSA sponsored Wingspread Conference on the PRC, March 18-19, 1979. It is expected that more thorough information on the PRC educational system will be available within the next year. This somewhat sketchy outline is prepared for the use of admission officers in the interim. For purposes of the discussion the educational system is presented in three time frames: 1) Pre-1966, 2) The "Lost Decade" of 1966-72 (1972-76 was a transitional period), and 3) 1976 to present. Remarks on English evaluation are covered in a separate section since the question transcends all three periods. (Editor's note: An updated version of this paper by Karlene Dickey (Stanford University) and G. James Haas will appear in the NAFSA Newsletter, Summer 1979.)

The Pre-1966 Period

Historically the Chinese have had a lengthy association with the U.S. educational system. Three Chinese boys attended New England boarding schools as early as 1847. Over 100 additional students came to the U.S. in the 1870s. There was a noticeable growth in enrollments after the Boxer Rebellion, and by 1942 some 1,500 Chinese students were enrolled here. This number had grown to roughly 4,000 by the 1949-1950 period.

The educational track for those schooled from the 1940s to 1966 was mainly a 6-6-4 format. The second six in the sequence were referred to as Middle School. There were exceptions to this format in that there were some 5-year university programs.

Educational records were kept on individuals during this period. Admissions officers should expect to see transcripts in a traditional format similar in appearance -- not subject content -- to what we now see from Taiwan. Grades may appear as percentages, in words - Excellent, Good, etc., or as A, B, C. It is suggested that placement in U.S. institutions be made on the basis of a year-for-a-year analysis with the understanding that the educational content in non-science areas especially had a strong socialist influence. During the Lost Decade described below, some academic records were destroyed from the Pre-1966 period, thus, some students may legitimately claim that their records are not available.

As of 1966 there were three main "flaws" in the system that had to be corrected according to the political leadership; 1) The system was elitist and created divisions in the society. Because of the competitive entrance examinations the universities were dominated by the children of urbanites and the

"bourgeoisie" of the new (Communist) elite. Status was ascribed more so than achieved. The system did not inculcate social consciousness. 2) Education was too theoretical. There was a need for refocusing on national development objectives and the immediate needs of the country. 3) The process of education was too long and therefore had to be shortened.

The "Lost Decade"

The Cultural Revolution 1966-1976, made some drastic adjustments to the structure of education. There was a repudiation of the competitive examination system and an attempt to emphasize the practical over the theoretical. After secondary school, the urbanite was required to spend 2 to 3 years in the country before going back to "mental" labors. The selection for return to higher education was based more on proper political attitudes than on academic merits. There was a breakdown of distinctions between the teacher and the students with all involved in political discussions and physical labors. This period very markedly changed the perceptions of authority, but it had some negative aspects. The development needs of the country were not being met. As might be expected, the morale of educators plunged. The constant confrontation caused a sense of inertia to develop in the populace.

Sequential records likely do not exist from 1966 to 1971, as there were no formal classes held during this period, at either the high schools or the universities. No new enrollments were made in the universities, therefore it would be highly unusual (even suspect) for a student to produce a college record for the 1966-1971 span. In effect, education was a blank at this time. "Passing" was determined mainly by political attitude rather than academic achievement. With very few exceptions, graduate level study stopped in 1966. An estimated profile of study completed in this period would run something like this:

Year	High School Graduates-Years of Schooling	College Graduates-Years of Schooling
1966	12	5
1967	11	4
1968	10	3
1969	9	2
1970	8	8 months
1971	7	No graduates 1971-74

It becomes obvious by the foregoing example that many of those who enrolled in the universities that reopened in the 1971-1976 period were in effect 7th or 8th graders. The problem was compounded even further by university study not being intensive as there were frequent trips to the country.

After 1971, the format became a 5-5-3 process. It is possible that some reconstruction of records can be made from the 1972-1976 period. These may appear in standard or paragraph form. Some graduate classes reopened in 1972-1973. University trained people from this period are today referred to as "young teachers." This is a subtle way of indicating that their academic credentials are suspect. The "Lost Decade" period ended with the removal of the "Gang of Four" from power in October, 1976.

To state the obvious, admission officers will need to assess records from this period cautiously. Be alert for the "closet scholar" - the dedicated student who studied privately in his home. A few research institutes did operate. (Research refers to a graduate level institution. An institute without the word research in its title was likely a junior college-type institution). A student who claims attendance at a research institute should be asked for a copy of his research report. Hopefully this can be assessed by the receiving U.S. institution. There would be significance in the level of the authority which commissioned the research -- i.e., the Ministry of Education, etc. Those claiming secondary school completion after 1976 should be asked to present their university entrance examination results. (See following section). It is suggested that graduates of the 3-year university programs not be accorded graduate status in the U.S. unless they had additional training at a research institute. The best procedure may be to admit such students in special status while their academic background is being assessed.

1976 to Present

The educational ladder is now mainly a 5-5-4 (sometimes 4-3-3-4) system with indication that there is an interest in someday increasing the 10 year elementary/secondary into an 11 or 12-year system. The school year is over 40 weeks. Vacations during a calendar year are about three weeks during winter and six weeks during the summer. Four "modernizations" are guiding the current educational scene: 1) There is emphasis on planning although a grand master plan does not exist. 2) There has been a return to the desire for academic excellence with a reinstituting of the examination system. 3) There is a renewed emphasis on theoretical knowledge, thus, the teacher is now back as the center of focus. 4) There has been a redefinition of political education in that the subject is no longer the major focal point of the school day.

In 1977, the national university entrance examinations were reinstituted with the content set at the provincial level. In 1978, the content was nationally set. Each student lists their preferred major and three schools to receive their scores. The schools then decide which of these students they will offer admission. There are two versions of the test -- one for science students, the other

for non-science programs. Each student must take a minimum of five tests. All students must take the tests in Politics, Mathematics, and Chinese Language. Those interested in science or medicine must also take Physics and Chemistry. Those interested in the social sciences and foreign languages take tests in History and Geography. There is an eighth examination field - foreign languages. Tests exist in seven languages: Arabic, French, English, German, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish. Information on the use of the foreign language test is somewhat incomplete at this writing. Students who studied a foreign language (at secondary level) are expected to take the language test (assuming it exists in a language they studied). The test, however, does not count as one of the required five unless the student intends to major in the language tested, in which case the foreign language test is substituted for mathematics. The use of the foreign language test when it is the sixth test of the student is unclear at this time. All tests are scored on the basis of 100 points per test. To (perhaps) accommodate the students from the "Lost Decade," graduation from middle school was not required for a student to be eligible to sit for the 1978 examination. Only 300,000 places were available. These were selected for post secondary study from a pool of 6.3 million. A student may attempt the examination only twice. Minimum scores required are not known at this time. (Minimum scores will vary from institution to institution.) In light of the competition and the usual scheme of Chinese grading, it is speculated that a total score above 300 would be required as a minimum for a student to receive an offer of admission. There was also a 1978 entrance examination for enrollment in graduate programs. Details on this are not available at present. (Editor's note: The United States Office of Education is expected to issue a report on these examinations before the end of 1979.)

It is suggested that admission officers require the above national examination results in making their admission decisions on students from this period. Academic records should be expected from applicants who attended school from about 1972 onwards, although, as noted earlier, there will likely not be a routine format for such documents especially in the 1972-1976 time frame. English translations of academic documents on PRC governmental sponsored students should be accepted as official. Those unofficially sponsored by sources outside PRC should have their documents accepted somewhat more cautiously. Since the PRC school year is somewhat longer than the U.S., it is not unreasonable to consider students who have completed the middle school program -- a total of ten years education -- for entrance to U.S. universities.

English Ability

The TOEFL is not currently available in the PRC. ETS is willing to offer it if PRC officials will give their approval. To establish a regular center (or centers) ETS needs about a year of lead time. Thus for 1979-1980 at least, English evaluation will need to be through other channels.

English majors at the university level -- even before the "Lost Decade" -- were trained in the classical literature with minimal emphasis on oral/aural skills At the high school level there is a shortage of trained English teachers. Some of those now filling such roles had crash training programs of as brief as three months. The ratio of teacher to student can be as high as 1:100. Students who learned English at the foreign language institutes will likely have better oral/aural skills than the university trained, but even these cannot be presumed to have adequate English communications skills for study in the U.S. Further, a good score on the English Language test on the university entrance examination should not be accepted as adequate evidence of English ability. Unless a U.S. institution has access to an interview report from a reliable (English speaking) source, it is suggested that admission officers proceed with the admission decision on the basis of an analysis of the students' academic documents. If acceptable, offer the student a conditional admission in regard to English with an indication that the English ability will need to be verified after arrival in the U.S. Caution the student that this may mean there will be a need for 6 to 12 months of special English training prior to starting academic work.

Observations at Random

1. The PRC is making contacts with U.S. institutions about accepting their students. The U.S. Government (ICA) is not making these decisions nor serving as a clearinghouse in distributing dossiers. So far, approximately 20 U.S. schools have had such contact.

2. This first year (1978-79) about 80% of the PRC requests to U.S. institutions will be for visiting scholar status. These are older people in the 35 to 45 age range who are established in their careers, but who are unlikely to be at the "frontier" of knowledge or research ability in their academic fields.

3. In regard to the people described in #2, U.S. institutions need to make clear what the arrangements are when a "visiting scholar" is accepted. Any fees to be charged need to be clearly outlined whether these be audit fees, lab fees, computer usage fees, or whatever. Do not make assumptions about what is generally understood. Remember, PRC citizens have no recent history with us in this regard.

4. The PRC does not seem to be concerned with the fact that Taiwan students will be enrolled on the same campus.

5. For the moment, no families are accompanying the scholars.

6. It is believed that privately sponsored students could gain approval to come to the U.S. These students would have their financial sponsorship base outside the PRC.

7. Underachievers are not a problem in the PRC. The students who come will know how to work. At the maximum, 400 additional students will come to the U.S. in 1979. There are currently about 100 here or expected shortly.

8. The special status suggested earlier in the section on English Ability may cause some initial difficulties if the PRC officials perceive this as some kind of a lesser status than a degree student. The U.S. institutions will need to be careful in their explanation.

9. There is no central office in PRC institutions that equates to a Study Abroad office as found in the U.S. If a U.S. institution wishes to send information to a PRC institution, they could simply address the material to the PRC institution and let them determine which is the proper office to review the material.

10. There are more than 600 tertiary level institutions in the PRC. Recently, 88 of these have been designated as key universities and colleges. The 88 are listed below:

Key Institutions in the Peoples Republic of China

1. Amoy University
2. Central China Engineering College
3. Central China Mining and Metallurgical College
4. Central Music College
5. Central Nationalities College
6. Changchun Geological College
7. Changsha Engineering College
8. Chekiang University
9. Chenchiang Agricultural Machinery College
10. Chentu Telecommunications Engineering College
11. Chinese University of Science and Technology
12. Chungking Construction Engineering College
13. Chungking University
14. Chungshan Medical College
15. Chungshan University
16. East China Engineering College
17. East China Petroleum College
18. East China Water Conservation College
19. Fuhsin Coal Mine College
20. Futan University
21. Harbin Engineering College
22. Harbin Shipbuilding Engineering College
23. Hofei Engineering College
24. Hopei Electric Power College

25. Hsiangtan University
26. Hunan University
27. Hupeh Construction Industry College
28. Inner Mongolia University
29. Kiangsi Communist Labor College
30. Kirin Engineering College
31. Kirin University
32. Kwangtung Chemical Engineering College
33. Lanchow University
34. Nankai University
35. Nanking Aeronautical Engineering College
36. Nanking Engineering College
37. Nanking Meteorological College
38. Nanking University
39. North China Agricultural College
40. North China Agro-Technical College
41. Northeast Engineering College
42. Northeast Heavy-Type Machine College
43. Northern Chiaotang University
44. Northwest Engineering University
45. Northwest Light Industry College
46. Northwest Telecommunications Engineering College
47. Northwest University
48. Peking Aeronautical Engineering College
49. Peking Chemical Engineering College
50. Peking College of Chinese Medicine
51. Peking Engineering College
52. Peking Foreign Languages College
53. Peking Foreign Trade College
54. Peking Iron and Steel Engineering College
55. Peking Medical College
56. Peking Normal College
57. Peking Physical Culture College
58. Peking Posts and Telecommunications College
59. Peking University (and its branches)
60. Shanghai Chemical Engineering College (and its branches)
61. Shanghai Chiaotung University
62. Shanghai Foreign Languages College
63. Shanghai No. 1 Medical College
64. Shanghai Normal College
65. Shanghai Textile Engineering College
66. Shantung Oceanology College
67. Shantung University
68. Sian Chiaotung University
69. Sinkiang University
70. South China Engineering College

71. Southwest Chiaotung University
72. Southwest Political Science and Law College
73. Szechwan Medical College
74. Szechwan Mining College
75. Szechwan University
76. Tachai Agricultural College
77. Teaching Petroleum College
78. Talien Engineering College
79. Talien Mercantile Marine College
80. Tientsin University
81. Tsinghua University (and its branches)
82. Tungchi University
83. Wuhan Geological College
84. Wuhan Hydroelectric Power College
85. Wuhan Survey and Cartography College
86. Wuhan University
87. Yunnan Forestry College
88. Yunnan University

Note: Chinese scholars from outside China view the nine underlined schools as being among their very best institutions.

Institutes of the Chinese Academy of Sciences -

Peking -- Institute of:

1. Acoustics
2. Atmospheric Physics
3. Atomic Energy
4. Automation
5. Biophysics
6. Botany
7. Chemical Engineering and Metallurgy
8. Chemistry
9. Computing Technology
10. Electrical Engineering
11. Electronics
12. Environmental Chemistry
13. Genetics
14. Geography
15. Geology
16. Geophysics
17. High Energy Physics
18. Mathematics
19. Mechanics
20. Microbiology
21. Natural Science History
22. Photochemistry
23. Physics
24. Psychology
25. Semiconductors
26. Vertebrate Palaeontology and Palaeoanthropology
27. Zoology

Committee for Complex Investigation of Natural Resources - Peking Observatory

Anhui -- Institute of Plasma Physics (Hofei)
Fujian -- Fujian Institute of the Structure of Matter (Fuzhou)
Gansu -- Institute of:
1. Chemical Physics (Lanzhou)
2. Desert Research (Lanzhou)
3. Glaciology and Cryopedology (Lanzhou)
4. Modern Physics (Lanzhou)
5. Plateau Atmospheric Physics (Lanzhou)

Guangdong - 1. Guangdong Institute of Botany (Guangzhou)
2. Guangdong Institute of Chemistry (Guangzhou)
3. Institute of Oceanography on South China Sea (Guangzhou)

Guizhou -- Institute of Geochemistry (Guiyang)

Hubei -- Hubei Institute for Rock and Soil Mechanics (Wuhan)

Jiangsu -- 1. Institute of Geological Paleontology (Nanjing)
2. Institute of Pedology (Nanjing)
3. Zhijin Shan Observatory (Nanjing)

Jilin -- 1. Institute of Optics and Fine Mechanics (Changchun)
2. Jilin Institute of Physics (Changchun)
3. Jilin Institute of Applied Chemistry (Changchun)

Liaoning -- Institute of: 1. Automation (Shenyang)
2. Chemical Physics (Dalian)
3. Computing Technology (Shenyang)
4. Forestry and Pedology (Shenyang)
5. Metal Research (Shenyang)

Shaanxi -- Institute of Optics and Fine Mechanics (Xi'an)

Shanghai -- Institute of: 1. Biochemistry
2. Cell Biology
3. Entomology
4. Materia Medica
5. Metallurgy
6. Nuclear Research
7. Optics & Fine Mechanics
8. Organic Chemistry
9. Physiology
10. Plant Physiology
11. Silicate Chemistry & Technology
12. Technical Physics

Shanghai Observatory

Shandong -- Institute of Oceanography (Qingdao)

Sichuan -- Southwest Institute of Physics (Luoshan)

Yunnan -- 1. Institute of High Energy Physics (Branch for Cosmic Ray Observation) (Kunming)
2. Yunnan Institute of Botany (Kunming)
3. Yunnan Institute of Zoology (Kunming)
4. Yunnan Observatory

(Based upon list supplied by Education Bureau, Chinese Academy of Science, November 1978.)

New Institutes recently reported:

1. Changsha Rare Earth Chemistry and Physics Institute
2. Changsha Earth Structure Research Institute
3. Institute of Theoretical Physics
4. Taoyuan Agricultural Modernization Research Institute
5. Institute of South Asian Studies (jointly with Peking University)

Institutes of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences

Institute of:

1. Literature
2. Foreign Literature
3. Linguistics
4. History
5. Modern History
6. World History
7. Philosophy
8. Economics
9. Industrial Economics
10. Agricultural Economics
11. Finance and Trade
12. World Economics
13. Nationalities (Ethnology)
14. Journalism
15. Archaeology
16. Law
17. Information
18. World Religions

(Source: Qishi Niandai (Hong Kong), December 1978.)

REFERENCES

Barendsen, R.D. The Educational Revolution in China. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1975. (Background information helpful to an undertsanding of recent developments in the educational system of China.)

Gamberg, R. Red and Expert. New York: Schocken Books, 1977. (Based on the author's visit to China and her discussions with students, workers, teachers, and professors at all three levels of education.)

Hawkins, J. "People's Republic of China." In The International Encyclopedia of Higher Education. Asa S. Knowles, Editor-in-Chief. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Jenkins, H.M. Briefing/Workshop on Student Scholars from the People's Republic of China and U.S. Colleges and Universities. Sponsored by NAFSA in cooperation with the Johnson Foundation. March 18-20, 1979. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1979.

Observations on the Relations between Education and Work in the People's Republic of China. Report of a Study Group, 1978. Clark Kerr, Chairman. Berkeley: The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1978.

Science and Technology in the People's Republic of China. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1977. (An attempt to identify and understand various influences on the science and technology of China and the discernment of future trends.)

Shi Ming Hu and Seifman, E. (Eds.) Toward a New World Outlook. New York: AMS Press, 1977. (Documentary history of the educational history of the People's Republic of China from 1949 to the present. An analysis of each of the educational periods including laws, decrees, and regulations governing education in China.)

APPENDIX III

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Admission and Academic Placement of Students from Selected Arab Countries. Frank J. Molek and Kathleen Brusick, editors, 1975. 107 pages. (Available from NAFSA. A report of the 1975 workshop sponsored by NAFSA and AACRAO. The report covers the educational systems of Jordan, Egypt, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia.)

The Admission and Academic Placement of Students from the Caribbean. Cynthia Fish, editor, 1973. 198 pages. (Available from NAFSA. A report of the 1972 workshop sponsored by NAFSA and AACRAO held in the Dominican Republic. Countries covered: Cuba, Dominican Republic, French West Indies, Haiti, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.)

The Admission and Academic Placement of Students from Nordic Countries. Cliff Sjogren, editor, 1974. 112 pages. (Available from NAFSA. A report of the 1973 workshop sponsored by NAFSA and AACRAO on Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden.)

The Admission and Placement of Students from Latin America: A Workshop Report. Joel Slocum, editor, 1971. (Available in microfiche from Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), Suite 630, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. A report of: Argentina, Chile, Ecuador , and Peru.)

The Admission and Placement of Students from the Pacific-Asia Area: A Workshop Report. Sanford C. Jameson, editor, 1970. 93 pages. (Available in microfiche from Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), Suite 630, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. A report of the 1969 Hawaii Workshop, co-sponsored by NAFSA, AACRAO, and the Institute for Technical Interchange at the East-West Center. A study of: Australia, Ceylon, Hong Kong, India, Malaysia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Singapore, Okinawa, and Pacific Islands.)

The Admission and Academic Placement of Students from Selected Sub-Saharan-African Countries. Cynthia Wise, editor, 1974. 258 pages. (Available from NAFSA. A report of the 1973 workshop sponsored by NAFSA and AACRAO. The report covers the educational systems of more than 20 majority-ruled African nations South of the Sahara.)

AMIDEAST Report (Quarterly). Published by AMIDEAST, Suite 100, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. (Up-to-date information on developments in the Middle East and North Africa.)

AMIDEAST Institutional Reports. (One- to four-page reports and profiles on individual Middle Eastern institutions covering history, organization of programs, degrees, certificates, and diplomas and grading scales.)

Bogomolov, Anatoli. Comparability of Engineering Courses and Degrees. Paris: UNESCO, 1974. (Part of UNESCO's Studies on International Equivalences of Degrees. Covers U.K., U.S., U.S.S.R., India, and France.)

Collection of Agreements Concerning the Equivalence of University Qualifications plus Supplement (Microfiche). Paris: International Association of Universities. (Chronological arrangement, starting in 1894, of the texts of the bilateral and multilateral agreements governing higher education relations throughout the world to help governments and universities with problems of international and interuniversity recognition of qualifications.)

Commonwealth Universities Yearbook (4 volumes). Annual. London: Association of Commonwealth Universities. (Detailed information on all universities in the Commonwealth Countries including officers, programs, length of study, degrees, certificates, and diplomas.)

de Grandpré, Marcel. Glossaire International. Paris: UNESCO, 1969. (International glossary of terminology related to credentials in 45 countries. Although ten years old, still fairly accurate. Part of the series Studies on International Equivalences of Degrees.)

Directory of First Degree Courses, 1978-79 (U.K.) London: Council for National Academic Awards, 1978.

Dupui, René Jean and Tunkin, Gregory. Comparability of Degrees and Diplomas in International Law. Paris: UNESCO, 1973. (Part of the series Studies on International Equivalences of Degrees. Included are: U.S., U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia, France, Egypt, and the Netherlands.)

Evaluation of Engineering Education and Experience Attained in India and Pakistan. Seneca,SC: National Council of Engineering Examiners, 1977. (Recommendations by the Council on evaluation regulations for licenses in the U.S.)

W. D. Halls. International Equivalences in Access to Higher Education. Paris: UNESCO, 1971. (Part of the series Studies on International Equivalences on Degrees. International overview and case studies on physics, chemistry, mathematics, mother tongue.)

International Association of Universities. Methods of Establishing Equivalences Between Degrees and Diplomas. Paris: UNESCO, 1970. (Part of UNESCO's series Studies on International Equivalences of Degrees. Includes: Czechoslovakia,France, Federal Republic of Germany, U.S.S.R., U.K., and U.S.)

The International Encyclopedia of Higher Education. Asa S. Knowles, Editor-in-Chief. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1977. (Description of 199 national systems of education, including years of study required for each level, diplomas, certificates, and degrees awarded at each educational level.)

International Handbook of Universities. Paris: The International Association of Universities. Published every three years. (Information on institutions, programs including length of study, degrees, diplomas, and certificates awarded . Not including Commonwealth countries.)

NAFSA Newsletter. (Newsletter published by the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. Trends and innovations in the evaluation field.)

Selection and Certification in Education and Employment. Paris: OECD, 1977. (Discussion of selection/certification at different educational levels and the role of credentials internationally.)

Sharp, Theodore. The Glossary of Foreign Educational Terms. Alhambra, California: Frank Savery Publishing, 1979. (Includes terminology for 16 European countries. Ecellent for checking translations.)

United States Office of Education Publications - Studies of Education in Other Countries (over 90). (Write to the U.S. Office of Education, Comparative Education Branch, U.S. Department of HEW, Washington, D.C. 20202, for a complete list of publications and prices. The publications examine the systems of education historically and socially. Some investigate particular types of education in a country. Provide good background on purpose and goals of the various systems.)

World Education Series. Available from AACRAO, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. (Excellent studies of individual national educational systems with admissions and placement recommendations. Reports specifically designed for the evaluator.)

World Guide to Higher Education: A Comparative Survey of Systems, Degrees, and Qualifications. Paris: UNESCO, 1976. (Handy "quickie" guide giving years of study for different levels, diplomas, certificates, and degrees awarded and includes foreign terminology.)

World Higher Education Communiqué. (A publication by IIE covering Africa, Asia, the Americas, Europe, and the Middle East -- offering highlights of major changes in the systems of education and brief profiles of the educational systems. Helpful for up-to-date information.)

The World of Learning. New York: Europa Publications. Bi-Annual. (Lists of universities and colleges with officers, language of study, faculties. Gives a representative listing of higher education institutions throughout the world.)

World Survey of Education. Volume IV Higher Education. Paris: UNESCO, 1966. (Although now outdated, gives excellent overview of higher education systems as they existed in early 1960s.) Volume V: Educational Policy, Legislation and Administration. (Background on educational systems worldwide in early 1960s including organigrams of the structures of many systems, primary, secondary, and tertiary.)

APPENDIX IV

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Wednesday, May 2, 1979
Warren Center
Ashland, Massachusetts

9:00 a.m. Registration/Exhibit of basic credentials evaluations materials.

9:30 a.m. Opening Remarks by Joy W. Viola, Director, CIHED

9:45 a.m. INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS IN EVALUATION AND RECOGNITION OF DEGREES:
"A Summary of UNESCO and Council of Europe Endeavors"
Sanford Jameson, Director, Office of International Education, College Entrance Examination Board
"The NAFSA Approach"
Hugh Jenkins, Executive Vice President, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs

10:30 a.m. Coffee Break

10:45 a.m. "Patterns of Educational Systems"
Joel Slocum, Director, Foreign Student Services, Columbia University

"Problems and Resources in Credentials Evaluations"
Gary Hopkins, Assistant Director of Admissions, University of Delaware

12:00 noon LUNCHEON BUFFET - Hayden Lodge Patio

1:30 p.m. Concurrent Discussion Groups

EVALUATION OF FOREIGN EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS FOR UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS:

Panelists: Eugene R. Chamberlain, Chairperson, Associate Director of Admissions and Advisor to Foreign Students, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Andrea Wolley, Assistant Director, Office of Admissions, Boston University
Steven Bissell, Assistant Director of Admissions and Coordinator of Foreign Students, Northeastern University

Resource Persons: Joel Slocum, Director, Foreign Student Services, Columbia University
Hugh Jenkins, Executive Vice President, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs

1:30 p.m. EVALUATION OF FOREIGN EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS FOR GRADUATE ADMISSION AND PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALING:

Panelists: Solveig M. Turner, Chairperson, Assistant Director CIHED, Northeastern University
Dennis DiCarlo, Educational Specialist, Bureau of Teacher Preparation, Certification, and Placement Massachusetts Department of Education
Albert C. Lefebvre, Academic Services Officer, College of Professional Studies, University of Massachusetts, Boston
Barbara Hammond, Assistant to the Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University

Resource Persons: Gary Hopkins, Assistant Director of Admissions, University of Delaware
Sanford Jameson, Director, Office of International Education, College Entrance Examination Board

3:30 p.m. Review of Working Sessions and Conclusion by Joy W. Viola and Discussion Chairpersons